

Laura Dubinsky KC



Call: 2002

Silk: 2022

Email: l.dubinsky@doughtystreet.co.uk

Profile

Laura appears in public law cases at all levels, with a particular focus upon cases with a refugee, immigration law or ECHR dimension. She is regularly instructed in test challenges to government policy and systemic failure; and in cases concerning novel or complex points of statutory construction.

Laura's practice also embraces asylum, immigration and deportation appeals and, in particular, the interface between refugee and extradition law (in which she is instructed by high profile individuals).

The civil liberties element of Laura's practice includes challenges to the scope of bail powers; the unlawful imposition of COVID curfews or administrative detention through habeas corpus, judicial review and civil actions for damages.

She is also instructed in cases concerning the ECHR (and previously EU law) in the supranational courts.

She often leads large multi-counsel teams, on behalf of multiple claimants or on behalf of a single party in major litigation.

Laura's clients include the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ('UNHCR'); NGOs; and both high net worth, high profile individuals and legally aided clients.

Examples of significant cases in which Laura has acted in recent years:

- **Rwanda litigation, R (AAA (Syria) and Others) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2023] UKSC 42, [2023] 1 WLR 4433, [2024] 1 All ER 1: leading counsel for the Intervener, UNHCR, in landmark case holding Home Secretary's policy of removing asylum seekers to Rwanda to be unlawful. UNHCR's evidence, and its analysis of the risks of *refoulement* for asylum seekers if transferred from the UK to Rwanda, were accepted to be of 'particular significance'.
- **R (IAB) Secretary of State for the Home Department and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities- redactions appeal** [2024] EWCA Civ 66: leading counsel for the successful claimants/ respondents in important case concerning public authorities' duty of candour in judicial review. The Court of Appeal found that the Secretaries of State's approach of routinely redacting the names of junior civil servants in disclosure breached their duty of candour.
- **R (IAB) Secretary of State for the Home Department and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities- licensing challenge:** leading counsel for the successful claimants in challenge to Draft Regulations which would have exempted asylum accommodation from vital protections afforded by the licensing regime for houses in multiple occupation. The Draft Regulations, challenged on multiple grounds including that they were *ultra vires*, were withdrawn the day before the full hearing of the challenge in the Administrative Court.
- **R (Kaitey) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2021] EWCA Civ 1875, [2022] QB 695: leading counsel for the Intervener, Bail for Immigration Detainees 'BID', in this civil liberties litigation concerning the scope of the bail power under the Immigration Act 2016. 90,000 immigrants were estimated to be affected.
- **R (Humnyntskiy) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2020] EWHC 1912 (Admin), [2021] 1 WLR 320: leading counsel for three successful claimants in challenge to the Home Office's policy and practice concerning accommodation for destitute immigrants under paragraph 9, Schedule 10, Immigration Act 2016.
- **CI (Nigeria) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2019] EWCA Civ 2027, [2020] Imm. A.R. 503, [2020] I.N.L.R. 191: leading counsel for the successful appellant in significant case concerning Article 8 ECHR and the circumstances in which a long-resident immigrant may be subject to deportation.

- **R (SM) v Lord Chancellor** [2021] EWHC 418 (Admin), [2021] 1 WLR 3815: leading counsel for the Intervener, BID , in important challenge to lack of legal aid provision for immigration detainees held in prisons. The lack of a duty advice scheme or equivalent was accepted to breach Article 14 read with Articles 2,3,5 and 8 ECHR.
- **Secretary of State for the Home Department v Viscu** [2019] EWCA Civ 1052, [2019] 1 WLR 5376, [2020] 1 All E.R. 988: leading counsel for the Intervener, the AIRE Centre, in appeal concerning EU law protections from expulsion for long resident immigrants and the approach to be taken to a period of custody in a young offenders' institution.
- **R (Majera) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2021] UKSC 46, [2022] AC 461: junior counsel for the Intervener, BID, in case concerning the duty of the executive to comply with a court order unless and until set aside.
- **R (DN (Rwanda) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2020] UKSC 9, [2020] AC 698: junior counsel for Intervener Bail for Immigration Detainees in leading case concerning false imprisonment and sequential decision-making.
- **R (JL) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2018] 1 WLR 4623: leading counsel for the successful appellant in challenge to employment prohibition (EU law grounds).
- **R (Help Refugees) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2018] EWCA Civ 2098, [2018] 4 WLR 168: leading counsel in the Divisional Court and junior counsel in the Court of Appeal for the partially successful claimant NGO. Challenge to the fairness of procedures applied to transfer decisions for unaccompanied minors under the 'Dubs Amendment' and to the local authority consultation.
- **R (Lauzikas) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2019] EWCA Civ 1168, [2019] 1 WLR 6625: leading counsel for the partially successful /appellant in important case concerning EU law protections applicable to administrative detention and the approach to causation and damages.
- **B (Algeria) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2018] UKSC 5, [2018] AC 418: junior counsel for the Intervener Bail for Immigration Detainees in landmark appeal before Supreme Court concerning power to impose bail conditions.

What the directories say

Chambers and Partners (listed in Administrative and Public Law; Civil Liberties and Human Rights; Immigration)

"A pleasure to deal with, fantastically bright, an excellent strategist and very committed to the client." "The extent of her knowledge is astounding. She is a powerful advocate and offers clients the best possible service". "[H]er ingenuity in coming up with novel points of law is unrivalled. She is a powerful advocate". "She does real front-line stuff and is so hands-on and forensic in the analysis of evidence". "She's an absolute expert who is pragmatic and really easy to work with". "She is incredibly incisive with the law".

"A leading light at the Immigration Bar, Laura Dubinsky KC is famed among peers and clients alike for her nous and insight into complex asylum and detention law. Her depth of knowledge is reflected by her routine appearances in the Court of Appeal and Supreme Court, where she frequently advises on landmark litigation concerning detention and removal."

Legal 500 (listed in Administrative Law and Human Rights; Immigration)

"Laura has an unparalleled work ethic and is forensic when it comes to detail. She puts the needs of her clients at the forefront of her litigation and is an extremely compelling advocate...Laura is a legal powerhouse". "Laura is one of the best public law and human rights lawyers in the country, specialising in immigration law, immigration detention and the rights of people facing deportation after having been convicted of criminal offences".

Publications

Laura is the primary author of Foreign National Prisoners, Law and Practice, LAG 2012.

Background

Before coming to the Bar, Laura Dubinsky worked as a senior trade union campaigner in the United States and Canada with UNITE, the North American textile and garment workers' union. She directed large-scale campaigns for trade union recognition and collective agreements.

Education

BA (Oxon)

MA (Columbia University NYC)

CPE

Related practice areas

Administrative & Public Law

Immigration

Actions Against the Police and Public Authorities

Anti-Trafficking

Children's Rights Group

Public Law

Laura's current public law work includes acting as leading counsel in judicial review concerning the Home Secretary's duty to hold an Article 3 ECHR compliant investigation into events at Manston House Short Term Holding Facility.

Laura appeared as leading counsel for the eight successful claimants/ respondents in **R (IAB) Secretary of State for the Home Department and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities- redactions appeal** [2024] EWCA Civ 66. In this important case concerning public authorities' duties in judicial review, the Court of Appeal found that the Secretaries of State's approach of routinely redacting the names of junior civil servants in disclosure breached their duty of candour.

Laura was also leading counsel for the same eight claimants in their successful judicial review, **R (IAB) Secretary of State for the Home Department and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities – challenge to licensing Draft Regulations**. The claimants challenged the Houses in Multiple Occupation (Asylum-Seeker Accommodation) (England) Regulations 2023 which would have exempted asylum accommodation from the licensing regime under Part 2 Housing Act 2004- including on grounds that the Draft Regulations were ultra vires; that both defendant Secretaries of State had breached their Public Sector Equality Duties and that the Draft Regulations were incompatible with Article 14 read with Articles 2 and 3 ECHR. The Draft Regulations were withdrawn the day before the full hearing of the judicial review.

Laura appeared as leading counsel for three successful claimants in **R (Humnyntskiy) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2020] EWHC 1912 (Admin), [2021] 1 WLR 320 a significant case concerning accommodation for immigrants under paragraph 9, Schedule 10, Immigration Act 2016; systemic unfairness; destitution and Article 3 ECHR; and false imprisonment. The Home Office's policy and practice concerning the provision of that accommodation to destitute foreign national former offenders were declared systemically unfair.

In **R (Majera) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2021] UKSC 46, [2021] 3 WLR 1075, Laura appeared as junior counsel for the Intervener, Bail for Immigration Detainees ('BID'). This case, concerning the consequences of a defective grant of bail by a tribunal, is a leading case concerning the duty of the executive to comply with a court order unless and until set aside.

Laura was also instructed as junior counsel for BID, intervening, in the Supreme Court in **R (DN (Rwanda) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2020] UKSC 9, [2020] AC 698. This important case establishes the vitiating effect of a prior unlawful decision upon an authorisation for detention.

In **R (Help Refugees) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2018] EWCA Civ 2098, [2018] 4 WLR 168 the leading case concerning s.67 Immigration Act 2016 (the 'Dubs amendment'), consultation duties and procedural fairness, Laura was leading counsel in the Divisional Court and junior counsel in the Court of Appeal for the partially successful claimant NGO.

Laura was junior counsel for the Interveners BID and Medical Justice in the Supreme Court in **R (O) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2016] UKSC 19, [2016] 1 WLR 1717. There, the Supreme Court gave guidance on the interpretation of published Home Office policy on the detention of the mentally ill; and held that there was no statutory immunity from liability for public law errors where a person was detained following a court recommendation for deportation.

Laura was counsel for the claimant in **R (Adelana) v Secretary of State for Justice** [2008] EWHC 2612 (Admin) in which the SSJ's policy precluding the grant of Release on Temporary Licence for many prisoners subject to confiscation orders was found to be unlawful on grounds of fettering of discretion.

She was junior counsel for the appellant in **R (Francis) v Secretary of State for Justice** [2012] EWCA Civ 1200, a primarily unsuccessful challenge to Secretary of State for Justice's policy on the grant of Home Detention Curfew to foreign national prisoners.

Laura was counsel for the claimant in **R (Mayaya) v SSHD** [2011] EWHC 3088 (Admin)/C4/2011/3273, a successful test challenge to the SSHD's policies on leave to remain for foreign national former offenders on grounds of fettering of discretion (partially successful in Administrative Court, appeal on further points then allowed by consent in Court of Appeal).

Immigration and Asylum

Laura was nominated as immigration silk of the year in the 2023 Legal 500 Bar Awards.

Refugee law

Laura was leading counsel for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ('UNHCR') in the landmark Rwanda litigation, **R (AAA (Syria) and Others) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2023] UKSC 42, [2023] 1 WLR 4433, [2024] 1 All ER 1. The Supreme Court upheld the judgment of the majority of the Court of Appeal (and agreed with their conclusions) holding the Home Secretary's policy of removing asylum seekers to Rwanda to be unlawful. UNHCR's evidence, and its analysis of the risks of *refoulement* for asylum seekers if transferred from the UK to Rwanda, were accepted to be of 'particular significance'.

Laura was previously leading counsel on behalf of UNHCR in a country guidance appeal before the Upper Tribunal concerning Eritrea. The Upper Tribunal found in **MST and Others, UNHCR Intervening**, (CG) [2016] UKUT 443 (IAC) that the Secretary of State's guidance to her caseworkers concerning safety on return to Eritrea was unlawful; and reaffirmed earlier country guidance which extended higher protection to Eritrean asylum applicants.

Laura's previous immigration and asylum cases include **R (J) v SSHD** [2009] EWHC 705 (Admin) (successful challenge and guidance case on certification under s.96 Nationality Immigration and Asylum Act 2002); and **HS (Afghanistan) v SSHD** [2009] EWCA Civ 771 and **M v SSHD** [2006] EWCA Civ 798 (successful reasons challenges).

In **HJ and HT v SSHD** [2011] 1 AC 596. Laura was junior counsel for the Appellant HJ (successful Supreme Court challenge overturning a line of domestic authority holding that refugee status is to be denied to gay men who will avoid persecution on return by concealing their sexuality).

Article 8 ECHR

Laura was leading counsel for the successful appellant in **CI (Nigeria) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2019] EWCA Civ 2027, [2020] Imm. A.R. 503 | [2020] I.N.L.R. 191, an important case concerning Article 8 ECHR and the approach to be taken to long-resident immigrants who arrive in the UK as children.

Immigration detention and bail

Laura has been instructed in many of the leading cases concerning the detention and bail of immigrants.

She was leading counsel for the partially successful appellant/respondent in **R (Lauzikas) v SSHD** [2019] 1 WLR 6625, important litigation establishing the scope of EU law protections applicable to detained EU nationals including the application of a necessity test; and concerning also causation and damages.

She was junior counsel for the appellant **Lumba in Lumba and Mighty v SSHD** [2011] 2 WLR (successful Supreme Court challenge to detention pursuant to an unlawful hidden policy, overturning line of authority which had held causation to be a defence to false imprisonment). BID instructed Laura as junior counsel in **R (SK) v SSHD** [2011] 1 WLR 1299 in which the Supreme Court held that a failure to carry out detention reviews, without more, rendered detention unlawful. She again acted as junior counsel in an intervention by BID in **B (Algeria) v SSHD** [2018] 2 WLR 651, in which the Supreme Court affirmed that the bail power under the Immigration Act 1971 is conditional upon there being a power to detain that can lawfully be exercised at the time. Laura was again instructed as junior counsel by BID in **R (DN (Rwanda) v SSHD** [2020] AC 698, in which the Supreme Court accepted that a material public law error in an anterior immigration detention bearing upon the decision to detain gives rise to the tort of false imprisonment.

Laura's other immigration detention cases include **R (Abdi) v SSHD** Times, March 11, 2011 (successful challenge to the detention of a former foreign national prisoner, guidance given on the relevance of time spent on appeal). She was also sole counsel for the Intervener, Liberty, in **R (Suppiah and Others) v SSHD** [2011] EWHC 2 (Admin), (2011) 108(4) LSG 18 (partially successful challenge to the detention of children under Immigration Act powers).

In recent landmark civil liberties litigation, Laura was leading counsel for the intervener, BID, in **R (Kaitey) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2021] EWC Civ 1875, [2022] QB 695 concerning the scope of the bail power under the Immigration Act 2016. 90,000 immigrants were estimated to be affected. The Court of Appeal held, contrary to the submissions of the appellant and intervener, that this bail power was subject to no limitation of time other than those imposed by the ECHR and by Padfield and Wednesbury principles.

Laura had previously been instructed as junior counsel by the same intervener in **B (Algeria) v SSHD** [2018] 2 WLR 651, concerning the predecessor bail regime, in which the Supreme Court affirmed that the bail power under the Immigration Act 1971 is conditional upon there being a power to detain that can lawfully be exercised at the time.

Laura was also junior counsel for the same intervener before the Supreme Court in **R (Majera) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2021] UKSC 46, [2022] AC 461, affirming the duty of the executive to comply with a court order for bail unless and until set aside.

Asylum accommodation

Laura was leading counsel for eight successful claimants in **R (IAB) Secretary of State for the Home Department and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and**

Communities. This was a challenge to the Houses in Multiple Occupation (Asylum-Seeker Accommodation) (England) Regulations 2023 which would have exempted asylum accommodation from the licensing regime under Part 2 Housing Act 2004- with potentially serious consequences for protections from overcrowding, hazards including fire, and unscrupulous landlords. The claimants asserted, among other points, that the Draft Regulations were incompatible with Article 14 ECHR read with Articles 2 and 3 ECHR and otherwise also *ultra vires*; that the Home Secretary had formed a policy to exempt asylum accommodation in breach of the ‘best interests of the child duty’ in s.55 Borders Citizenship and Immigration Act 2009; and that both defendant Secretaries of State had breached their public sector equality duties and their *Tameside* duties of inquiry. The Draft Regulations were withdrawn the day before the full hearing of the judicial review.

Laura was also leading counsel for three successful claimants in **R (Humnyntskiy) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2020] EWHC 1912 (Admin), [2021] 1 WLR 320. That was a challenge to the Home Office’s policy and practice concerning accommodation for destitute immigrants under paragraph 9, Schedule 10, Immigration Act 2016; the Administrative Court accepted that the policy and practice were unlawful; that one of the claimants had suffered a breach of Article 3 ECHR and that the other two claimants had been falsely imprisoned owing to material public law errors in the denial of bail accommodation and consequently bail.

EU free movement law

Laura was leading counsel for the AIRE Centre, intervening, in **SSHD v Viscu** [2019] EWCA Civ 1052, [2019] 1 WLR 5376, [2020] 1 All ER 988, in which the Court of Appeal gave guidance on the application of EU law protections from expulsion to long-resident EU nationals and, in particular, the approach to be taken to youth custody and integration.

Laura was leading counsel for the successful appellant in **R (JL) v SSHD** [2018] 1 WLR 4623, in which the Secretary of State conceded in the Court of Appeal that the prohibition of employment by an EU national must in itself be proportionate and justified and cannot be the automatic consequence of a decision to deport.

She was also leading counsel for the partially successful claimant/ appellant in the Administrative Court and Court of Appeal in **R (Lauzikas) v SSHD** [2019] 1 WLR 6625 . That is the first domestic case to clarify that the administrative detention of an EU national must satisfy a necessity test and cannot be based on previous convictions alone.

Laura was junior counsel for the appellant in a landmark case heard by the Grand Chamber of the CJEU on a preliminary reference, Case C-304/14 **CS v SSHD**. The Grand Chamber

held that a third country national parent or carer can only be expelled, where this would cause the constructive expulsion of a dependent EU Citizen from the territory of the EU, where the third country national poses a 'genuine, present and sufficiently serious threat to one of the fundamental interests of society'.

She was junior counsel for the appellant in **Nouazli v SSHD** [2016] 1 WLR 1565 concerning the question of whether the detention power conferred by Regulation 24(1) of the EEA Regulations 2006 was compatible with EU law. The appeal before the Supreme Court was unsuccessful.

Laura was counsel for the appellant in **Arranz v SSHD** [2017] UKUT 294, in which the President of the Upper Tribunal Immigration and Asylum Chamber set out the test for the deportation of EU nationals. Note: following fresh CJEU authority, the Secretary of State's appeal concerning one aspect of the Arranz judgment (the Bouchereau test) was allowed by consent.

Interface of asylum and extradition

Laura acts in cases concerning the interface between asylum and extradition. She was leading counsel for the unsuccessful claimant in **R (Troitino) v National Crime Agency** [2017] EWHC 931 (Admin), on the question of what constitutes an "asylum claim" for the purposes of invoking the bar to extradition in s.39(3) Extradition Act 2003.

International Human Rights Law

Laura has been instructed in litigation around the prohibition of torture. She was instructed as junior counsel by a consortium of human rights organisations intervening in **A and Others v SSHD** [2006] 2 AC 221 (inadmissibility of evidence obtained under torture). She was also junior counsel for the Interveners in both the Court of Appeal and House of Lords in **Ronald Jones & Others v Saudi Arabia** [2007] 1 AC 270 (sovereign immunity and claims against foreign states over torture).

Laura also acts in cases with an EU law dimension. She was junior counsel in Case C-165/14 **CS v SSHD**, a landmark case in the Grand Chamber of the Court of Justice concerning the protections enjoyed by EU Citizens from constructive expulsion from EU territory.

She is also instructed in the ECtHR and has acted for applicants and interveners in a series of communicated applications – to date either settled or unsuccessful- challenging the lack of time limits in the UK's regime for the detention of immigrants.

Equality and Discrimination

Laura was leading counsel for eight successful claimants in **R (IAB) Secretary of State for the Home Department and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities**. This was a challenge to the Houses in Multiple Occupation (Asylum-Seeker Accommodation) (England) Regulations 2023 which would have exempted asylum accommodation from the licensing regime under Part 2 Housing Act 2004- with potentially serious consequences for protections from overcrowding, hazards including fire, and unscrupulous landlords. The claimants asserted, among other points, that the Draft Regulations were incompatible with Article 14 ECHR read with Articles 2 and 3 ECHR and otherwise also ultra vires; and that both defendant Secretaries of State had breached their public sector equality duties. The Draft Regulations were withdrawn the day before the full hearing of the judicial review.

Laura was leading counsel for the Intervener, Bail for Immigration Detainees in **R (SM) v Lord Chancellor** [2021] EWHC 418 (Admin), [2021] 1 WLR 3815 . The Claimant and Intervener contended that the lack of legal aid provision for immigration detainees held in prisons (in comparison to those held in immigration removal centres) breached Article 14 read with Articles 2,3,5 and 8 ECHR . Declaration granted.

Laura was junior counsel for one of the successful appellants in the landmark Supreme Court challenge concerning Refugee convention protection for gay and lesbian applicants. In **HJ and HT v SSHD** [2011] 1 AC 596, the Supreme Court overturned a line of domestic authority holding that refugee status was to be denied to gay men who will avoid persecution on return by concealing their sexuality.

She was junior counsel for the appellant in **Nouazli v SSHD** [2016] 1 WLR 1565. The Supreme Court held that a third country national exercising no EU law rights is not a permissible comparator for a person exercising free movement rights; so that secondary legislation can lawfully treat immigrants exercising EU free movement rights in the UK less favourably than third country nationals who are not.

Actions Against the Police and Public Authorities

Laura has been instructed in many of the landmark cases before the Court of Appeal and Supreme Court concerning the administrative detention and bail of immigrants.

Administrative detention

Laura was leading counsel for the partially successful appellant/respondent in **R (Lauzikas) v SSHD** [2019] 1 WLR 6625, important litigation establishing the scope of EU law protections applicable to detained EU nationals including the application of a necessity test; and concerning also causation and damages.

She was junior counsel for the appellant Lumba in **Lumba and Mighty v SSHD** [2011] 2 WLR (successful Supreme Court challenge to detention pursuant to an unlawful hidden policy, overturning line of authority which had held causation to be a defence to false imprisonment).

BID instructed Laura as junior counsel in **R (SK) v SSHD** [2011] 1 WLR 1299 in which the Supreme Court held that a failure to carry out detention reviews, without more, rendered detention unlawful. Laura was again instructed as junior counsel by BID in **R (DN (Rwanda) v SSHD** [2020] AC 698, in which the Supreme Court accepted that a material public law error in an anterior immigration detention bearing upon the decision to detain gives rise to the tort of false imprisonment.

Laura's other immigration detention cases include **R (Abdi) v SSHD** Times, March 11, 2011 (successful challenge to the detention of a former foreign national prisoner, guidance given on the relevance of time spent on appeal). She was also sole counsel for the Intervener, Liberty, in **R (Suppiah and Others) v SSHD** [2011] EWHC 2 (Admin), (2011) 108(4) LSG 18 (partially successful challenge to the detention of children under Immigration Act powers).

Bail

In recent landmark civil liberties litigation, Laura was leading counsel for the intervener, BID, in **R (Kaitey) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2021] EWC Civ 1875, [2022] QB 695** concerning the scope of the bail power under the Immigration Act 2016. 90,000 immigrants were estimated to be affected. The Court of Appeal held, contrary to the submissions of the appellant and intervener, that this bail power was subject to no limitation of time other than those imposed by the ECHR and by Padfield and Wednesbury principles.

Laura had previously been instructed as junior counsel by the same intervener in **B (Algeria) v SSHD** [2018] 2 WLR 651, concerning the predecessor bail regime, in which the Supreme Court affirmed that the bail power under the Immigration Act 1971 is conditional upon there being a power to detain that can lawfully be exercised at the time.

Laura was also junior counsel for the same intervener before the Supreme Court in **R (Majera) v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2021] UKSC 46, [2022] AC 461,

affirming the duty of the executive to comply with a court order for bail unless and until set aside.

Curfews

Laura is currently instructed by three claimants in a test challenge in the Queen's Bench Division to the unlawful imposition of curfews on asylum seekers residing in hotels, purportedly to enforce COVID controls.

Civil claims for damages

Laura's practice includes civil claims for damages. In **E v the Home Office**, Unreported, Central London County Court, 9CL01651, 10 June 2010, she acted for the successful claimant who was awarded £57,500 (including £25,000 exemplary damages) for a period of one month's unlawful detention. In **S, C, D v Home Office Unreported**, HQ09X01155, Queen's Bench Division Laura acted on behalf of three claimants who won damages exceeding £100,000 in total for a period of 3 and a half months' unlawful detention, including exemplary damages, before a Master. She is currently instructed by three claimants in a test challenge in the Queen's Bench Division to the unlawful imposition of curfews on asylum seekers residing in hotels, purportedly to enforce COVID controls. See also curfews, above.