

## **Summary Of Responses to the Consultation on the *draft* Justice Reform (Amendment) Bill 2025**

**December 2025**

## **INDEX TO CONTENTS**

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>		
1.	The Consultation	Page 3
2.	The Key proposals	Page 4
3.	The Issues	Page 5
<b>SUMMARY OF RESPONSES</b>		
4.	Submission of responses to the Consultation	Page 6
5.	Questions on the Justice Reform (Amendment) Bill 2025	Page 6
5.1.	Section 7.2 of the Consultation - Key corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the Summary Courts.	Page 7
5.2.	Section 7.3 of the Consultation - Key corrections or enhancements specific to the procedure of the Juvenile Courts/Youth Courts.	Page 11
5.3.	Section 7.4 of the Consultation - Other fresh changes or improvements to the procedure of the Summary Courts (COSJ) or Court of General Gaol Delivery (CGGD), or changes that support the operation and administration of the Criminal Justice System.	Page 14
5.4.	Section 7.5 of the Consultation - Fresh changes in other key policy areas	Page 21
5.5.	General feedback – JRAB	Page 38
6.	Questions on the Contempt of Court Bill 2025	Page 39
7.	Next steps	Page 39
8.	Consultation Questions	Page 39

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. The Consultation**

The Department of Home Affairs (DHA) conducted a five-week public consultation from 22 September to 27 October 2025. The purpose of the consultation was to gather public views on two proposed Bills, the *draft* Justice Reform (Amendment) Bill 2025 ("JRAB") and the *draft* Contempt of Court Bill 2025 ("COCB").

Both Bills are included in the legislative programme under the [Island Plan](#).

In preparing the draft Bills, the Department engaged extensively with key stakeholders across the Criminal Justice System. These stakeholders supported a detailed review of the operational impact of the [Justice Reform Act 2021](#) and contributed constructive suggestions for enhancements to that Act, or to other connected legislation on which the Criminal Justice System operates. These proposals were considered by the Department and, where appropriate, incorporated into the JRAB. Additionally, the JRAB also contained proposed amendments in response to outstanding Tynwald recommendations and designed to address specific issues identified by such recommendations.

Alongside the JRAB, the COCB was finalised for consultation. The COCB harmonised with the broader aims of the JRAB, and in particular, the Department's understanding that it was important to address deficiencies within existing provisions in relation to contempt of court as part of the wider operation of the justice process, as this had been highlighted by stakeholders.

The proposed legislative changes set out in the Bills are intended to strengthen the Island's justice system in line with the goals of the [Criminal Justice Strategy](#), particularly those relating to increased effectiveness and efficiency. While the Strategy is currently under review and will shortly be refreshed<sup>1</sup>, its core objectives remain unchanged. Where appropriate, provisions have been informed by legislation in neighbouring jurisdictions, notably England and Wales, as in many instances the law of the Island is based on existing parallel law from that jurisdiction.

As part of its [2025–2026 Department Plan](#), the Department of Home Affairs remains committed to progressing the JRAB and the COCB.

The feedback received during the consultation, as summarised in this document, has informed the Department's consideration of how best to finalise the JRAB, which it is proposed will begin its progression through the legislative branches at the end of 2025. As was noted within the Consultation, the JRAB has been the "working title" of the Bill. Its "on introduction" title is the *Justice and Home Affairs (Reform and Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2025*.

Separately, feedback received during the consultation in relation to the COCB is in the process of being reviewed and summarised and will be published on the Consultation Hub in the near future, within a dedicated Summary of Responses on that Bill. It is proposed that the COCB will begin its progression through the legislative branches in early 2026.

---

<sup>1</sup> A workstream in connection with the [Criminal Justice Strategy](#) can be found in the [Department Plan 2025/26](#)

The [Consultation](#) sought to identify the issues of greatest importance to both key stakeholders<sup>2</sup> and the wider public, and to set out information about these proposed changes in a format that was accessible to all parties. The responses received provided valuable insight from key stakeholders, the public and other interested parties.

We are grateful for all comments and correspondence received. In summarising responses, it has not been possible to reproduce all commentary. Comments may have been summarised or paraphrased as needed to maintain anonymity of respondents and focus on any themes.

The Department notes the relatively small number of responses overall (32) and that the majority of respondents commented only on proposed changes to the Firearms Act 1947 and the Shotguns, Air Weapons and Cross-bows Act 1994.

## 2. The Key proposals

The [Consultation](#) in relation to the JRAB was designed to seek views on the proposed corrections or enhancements to the [Justice Reform Act 2021](#), brought by the JRAB, along with fresh policy matters set out within the JRAB.

Given the technical and corrective nature of many of the JRAB changes, the consultation primarily focused on providing clear explanations of these and any rationale underpinning them.

To facilitate meaningful feedback, the consultation was structured into thematic sections, each accompanied by targeted questions aligned with the relevant legislative proposals.

### **Section 7 related to the *draft* JRAB:**

- **Section 7.1** provided a brief introduction to the structure of the consultation on the JRAB, and the complexity of that Bill which gives rise to this need for a structured consultation approach.

Within the immersive online Consultation Survey, information from the following sections of the consultation document were reproduced, wherever possible, to facilitate respondents when considering and responding to the Consultation Survey.

- **Section 7.2** addressed corrections and procedural enhancements relating to the Summary Courts.
- **Section 7.3** focused on corrections and procedural improvements concerning the Juvenile Courts/Youth Courts.
- **Section 7.4** covered additional proposed changes to the Summary Courts (COSJ) and the CGGD, as well as broader amendments aimed at improving the operation and administration of the Criminal Justice System.
- **Section 7.5** explored new proposals in other key policy areas.

---

<sup>2</sup> A list of key stakeholders was set out at [Appendix 2 of the Consultation Document \(set out on page 80 of that document\)](#). Key stakeholders received targeted correspondence from the Department, highlighting the Consultation commencement, and inviting them to share their views.

### **Section 8 related to the *draft* COCB:**

- **Section 8** provided background and context in relation to the proposed *draft* COCB.

***As noted above, review and summarisation of this feedback will be published within a dedicated Summary of Responses, that will be separate to this Summary of Responses which deals with the JRAB alone.***

In summarising the feedback received through the consultation, the Department adopted the same structured approach used in the original consultation document. This ensures that responses were considered in direct relation to the relevant sections and proposals, and full details can be found within the Summary of Responses.

We are grateful for all comments and correspondence submitted.

## **3. The Issues**

The consultation on the *draft* JRAB resulted in a range of views which have been carefully considered by the Department.

While the majority of enhancements, modifications or fresh changes were welcomed, one topic stood out as particularly significant in terms of response, perceived impact or next steps following consultation on the Bills.

This was the proposed changes in relation to the Firearms Act 1947 & Shotguns, Air Weapons and Cross-bows Act 1994 [see Questions 10 and 15 which can be found on pages 23 and 29 of this Summary] which received predominantly negative feedback.

Beyond this, the small number of respondents not responding to the firearms law changes did set out some strong views in connection with matters that they viewed as being of the utmost importance, that broadly fell to the themes of safeguarding and protections for victims (particularly the victims of sexual crimes) and considerations related to Youth Justice. There was widespread support for any changes that protect individuals including changes to the:

- Protection from Harassment Act 2000, which can be found on page 31 of this Summary
- Criminal Justice, Police and Courts Act 2007, which can be found on page 34 of this Summary
- Domestic Abuse Act 2020, which can be found on page 35 of this Summary
- Sexual Offences and Obscene Publications Act 2021, which can be found on page 37 of this Summary

As the response level to the consultation was low, while the Department carefully considered all responses, unless there was a strong case for an amendment to be made, the Department proposes to progress with the policy approach set out in the JRAB.

Some respondents put forward a single view throughout their responses. These individual views have been considered but have generally not given rise to changes.

Where a strong case for amendment has been put forward by respondents, some redrafting may be seen in the finalised Bill. Where changes have been made following consultation, where possible, these are set out under the individual consultation questions below. In some cases, feedback went beyond the targeted focus of the JRAB, but can be considered when the other Bills are progressed.

## **SUMMARY OF RESPONSES**

### **4. Submission of responses to the consultation**

#### **4.1 Responses the Department received.**



The Department received a total of **32** responses: -

- 23 responses were received via the online [Consultation Hub](#) survey; and,
- 9 written responses were received.

Respondents who submitted their response via the online Consultation Hub survey were able to provide free-text comments on each of the key changes. Those answering in writing (usually in the form of a letter) made comments that, where appropriate<sup>3</sup>, have been summarised alongside the consultation question/theme they best correspond to.

The Department is grateful to all respondents who took part in this consultation and shared their views for consideration.

#### **4.2 Breakdown of Responses**



Of the 32 responses received: -

- 21 were from individuals; and,
- 11 were on behalf of an organisation/business.

### **5. Questions on the Justice Reform (Amendment) Bill 2025**

The [Consultation](#) was designed to facilitate respondents' consideration of the proposed corrections or enhancements to the [Justice Reform Act 2021](#), brought by the JRAB, along with fresh policy matters set out within the JRAB.

Given the technical and corrective nature of many of the JRAB changes, the consultation primarily focused on providing clear explanations of these and any rationale underpinning them, and this information was reproduced within the immersive Consultation Survey wherever possible.

---

<sup>3</sup> Those who made responses via the online Consultation Hub survey were required to indicate whether they agreed that their response might be published in full, published anonymously or that did not wish to have their response published (so their response formed part of statistical data only). Those who responded in writing we asked to confirm a preference for data publication.

To facilitate meaningful feedback, the consultation was structured into thematic sections, each accompanied by targeted questions aligned with the relevant legislative proposals.

These thematic sections within the [Consultation](#) were as follows:

- **Section 7.1 of the Consultation** provided a brief introduction to the structure of the consultation on the JRAB, and the complexity of that Bill which gives rise to this need for a structured consultation approach. No questions accompanied this section as it provided introductory information only.
- **Section 7.2 of the Consultation** addressed corrections and procedural enhancements relating to the Summary Courts.
- **Section 7.3 of the Consultation** focused on corrections and procedural improvements concerning the Juvenile Courts/Youth Courts.
- **Section 7.4 of the Consultation** covered additional proposed changes to the Summary Courts (COSJ) and the CGGD, as well as broader amendments aimed at improving the operation and administration of the Criminal Justice System.
- **Section 7.5 of the Consultation** explored new proposals in other key policy areas.

The Consultation Survey questions were found at section 14 [of the Consultation](#) (page 70 onwards), and, as noted, the online Survey was immersive.

For ease of reference, the following sections summarise the responses made to the various thematic sections of the Consultation, and the questions asked in relation to those thematic sections.

Abbreviations used frequently throughout the following sections will include:

- CC1872 for Criminal Code 1872
- CJ,P&CA2007 for Criminal Justice, Police and Courts Act 2007
- CJA1993 for Criminal Jurisdiction Act 1993
- HCA1991 for High Court Act 1991
- PPPA1998 for Police Powers and Procedures Act 1998
- SJA1989 for Summary Jurisdiction Act 1989

## **5.1 - Section 7.2 of the Consultation - Key corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the Summary Courts.**

### **Question 1:**

#### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the Summary Courts set out in Section 7.2?

#### **You said:**

There were a total of **9** responses received to this question.

From the limited number of responses, there appeared to be a balance between those who were supportive of the changes, and those who either viewed the changes as potentially negative, or in some instances, those who did not appear to fully understand the proposed impact of the changes on already existing procedures.

Positive feedback was received for improvements in efficiency or reduction of delay for matters to be considered resulting from the changes, this was taken to be beneficial for victims, witnesses or agencies that support the Criminal Justice System. Additionally, there was support for the more general harmonisation of penalties for offences across Manx statute law.

Other more nuanced, or negative views, included comments on the role of lay magistrates and Summary Courts and the scope of their sentencing powers and the comments of individual respondents on the penalties for criminal offences such as rape or assault, and whether these were to be limited in some manner because of the changes being made.

Perceived alignment with the England and Wales approach was questioned by one respondent. A mandatory right to jury trial in any instance where the sentence was likely to exceed 2 years was suggested, as was training for magistrates, and provision of Sentencing Council Guidelines.

#### **We did:**

The Department has carefully considered the small number of responses submitted to this question and as no strong case for amendment was made, the Department proposes to progress with the policy approach set out in the JRAB.

Additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period has identified further matters which have been considered. Taking account of this feedback some redrafting has been incorporated within the finalised version of the JRAB.

This includes:

<b>Change and rationale for change</b>	<b>Section of the SJA1989 impacted</b>
<p>A harmonisation of language around “and offence triable either way” or “an offence triable on information” to ensure that the wording of section 1A of the SJA1989 (that sets out the extended powers of the Summary Court) is wholly clear, has been proposed throughout the SJA1989, with appropriate changes set out in the JRAB to achieve this end.</p> <p>Use of the terms “an offence”, “on information” and “trial either way” has been subject to a technical review to ensure that the language appearing in all places is unambiguous and there is clarity across the span of changes made to this end. This removes the need for “court discretion” and clarifies which offences fall to the new procedures (and the breadth of sentence which an offence might attract).</p> <p>Additionally, any contradiction within the SJA1989 (or the CJA 1993) with regard to these terms (and by extension the procedures to be followed) have been identified and removed (by way of proposed adjustment to the sections of the SJA1989 identified to the right of this table).</p>	<p>Section 15A (1), 15B (1), 17(1A) (a), 17(1B) (a), 18(1), 18(5), 18A (2), 18C (2)-(7) &amp; (9), 18D (5) 19(5)(a), 32(3), 47(1) 47(1A), 75(2A)</p>



Where not directly relevant to the targeted changes in the JRAB, feedback will be noted for consideration in relation to the Department's planned Sentencing Bill, which it is intended will be developed in the next legislative period. This is intended to review existing methods of disposal including sentences that can be handed down for existing offences and any current alternatives to custody – such as "community orders"<sup>4</sup> – as well as considering the modernisation and harmonisation of the Island's laws in these areas. This approach has been successfully adopted in England and Wales, where the [Sentencing Act 2020 \(an Act of Parliament\)](#), sets out a consolidated approach to sentencing.

As noted above, additional drafting changes have been incorporated into the JRAB at this time, to ensure full clarity of language around "information only" offences and offences "triable either way", and the general application of the [fresh section 1A of the SJA1989 \(shown as amended by the Justice Reform Act 2021 and proposed to be amended by the JRAB\)](#). This is the key section which deals with the extended jurisdiction of the Summary Courts, and how that will apply to offences that are otherwise "information only".

It is noted that a range of "information only" offences are **currently** triable by the Summary Courts [under the existing SJA1989](#). Such offences are set out in Schedule 2 *Offences triable on information which can be dealt with summarily* of that Act, which includes certain assault or sexual offences, that are currently dealt with in accordance with section 16 of that Act. In most instances, this means that currently a person convicted in the Summary Courts of an offence set out in Schedule 2 may be dealt with by way of a sentence not exceeding 12 months, or to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale, or both. Although lay magistrates can already in some instances sentence for 12 months but less than 2 years. Regular training for lay magistrates is currently provided. This information is noted as it appeared to be the case that some respondents were unaware that the Summary Courts can already deal with certain violent or sexual offences, in accordance with existing procedures. More serious offences (and in particular those that will attract a sentence of over 2 years custody, on information), will continue to be dealt with by the CGGD (or sentenced in those Courts, as required). Aside from fraud, jury tampering and defendant request, CGGD trials will continue to be way of trial by jury.

The corrections and enhancements proposed in the JRAB are wider ranging than those [under the existing SJA1989](#), or those contained in [the Justice Reform Act 2021](#).

Finally, it is noted that the JRAB contains proposals in relation to the establishment of a Sentencing Council<sup>5</sup> that might, once convened, develop sentencing guidance as required.

The overarching impacts of the proposed changes to the procedure of the Summary Courts are illustrated in an infographic (which was originally found within page 24 [of the Consultation](#)). The Department proposes to continue to progress these changes, with minor amendments identified during the consultation period.

---

<sup>4</sup> most of which are set out in the list of "community orders" found within section 47 of the [Criminal Justice, Police and Courts Act 2007](#)

<sup>5</sup> Set out in the changes proposed to be made to the [Criminal Justice, Police and Courts Act 2007 \(shown as proposed to be amended\)](#), by the insertion of a fresh section 40A *Sentencing council*. More information can be found at page 55 of the [Consultation document](#).

## Impact of the corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the **SUMMARY COURTS**

### Current Day

#### Summary Jurisdiction Act 1989

Establishes Courts of Summary Jurisdiction (Summary Courts) including the Juvenile Court.

Sets out procedure that governs these courts, including committals (how people get transferred to the Court of General Gaol Delivery for trial for more serious offences)

Offences that have a summary penalty (where an Act states something like "on summary trial" or states a penalty that reads "(summary) — XX months' custody") are dealt with by the Summary Courts.

Certain information only offences (those set out in Schedule 2 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1989) can be dealt with by the Summary Courts.

### Justice Reform Act 2021

Amends Summary Jurisdiction Act 1989

Abolishes committal procedure (how people get from Summary Courts to Court of General Gaol Delivery now) and sets out a fresh "sending" process (a more streamlined way of transferring people to the Court of General Gaol Delivery).

Extends the jurisdiction of the High Bailiff to try information only offences meaning that any offence that is not murder or treason can be tried by the High Bailiff presiding with a sentence range of up to 2 years custody or an unlimited fine.

Amends the statute book to remove the concepts of misdemeanour and felony, and to insert the "two tier" summary penalties i.e. (summary – (High Bailiff) - 2 years custody or a fine).

### Justice Reform (Amendment) Bill 2025

Further amends the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1989 (as amended by the Justice Reform Act 2021)

Further enhances the sending process (by providing for variation in relation to "breaking" joint counts between juveniles and adults, providing for the Summary Courts to remand the accused on bail or in custody when sending to the CGD, establishes additional reporting restrictions for "venue proceedings", makes clear that depositions follow the procedure set out in paragraph 4/5 of fresh Schedule A1). Better carrying through these policy aims as settled in the Justice Reform Act 2021

Extends the jurisdiction of the Summary Courts as a whole to try information only offences meaning that any offence that is not murder or treason can be tried by any Summary Court with a sentencing range of up to 2 years custody and an unlimited fine available to that Court (rather than just Summary Courts where the High Bailiff / a Deputy High Bailiff is presiding).

Also adjusts maximum consecutive aggregate sentence to 24 months in all Summary Courts.

Amends enactments to remove specific sentencing powers for the High Bailiff, in consequence of all courts of summary jurisdiction being able to impose a maximum 2 years custody and a fine.

## 5.2 - Section 7.3 of the Consultation related to Key corrections or enhancements specific to the procedure of the Juvenile Courts/Youth Courts.

### Question 2:

#### We asked:

Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the Juvenile Courts/Youth Courts as set out in Section 7.3?

#### You said:

There were a total of **4** responses received to this question.

From the very limited number of responses, their tone and content aligned with the responses made in connection with section 7.2 of the Consultation (corrections and enhancements related to the procedure of the Summary Courts).

The positive impact of improvements in efficiency or reduction of delay for matters was once again raised for victims, witnesses or agencies that support the Criminal Justice System.

There were some nuanced or negative views, which once again related to the appropriateness of extending sentencing powers (within the Summary Courts as a whole).

One respondent queried whether the approach in the Youth Court would mirror that taken in England and Wales and be "child-focussed." In England and Wales specific guidance has been issued by the [Sentencing Council, in relation to the sentencing of children and young people](#). Additionally, other guidance, such as the [Youth Court Bench Book](#), exists for that jurisdiction.

#### We did:

Having reviewed the limited responses on the proposed corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the Youth Court, the Department intends to continue to progress these changes after carefully considering the comments of respondents.

Additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period has identified further matters which have been considered. Taking account of this feedback some redrafting has been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill.

This includes:

Change and rationale for change	Section of the SJA1989 impacted
At section 18D <i>Sending cases to a Court of General Gaol Delivery; children and young persons</i> clarification was indicated as being helpful, that the summary court in this instance might include a youth court. This is of particular reference here, as the procedure around sending (to the Court of General Gaol Delivery)	18D (for ease of reference it is noted that section 1A as inserted into the

for children and young persons “defaults” to that stated at section 19 as it connects to section 18D, and 18C (7) or 18C(8)(a).  Adjustment has been made to add wording that states “(including a youth court)”.	SJA1989, makes a similar notation that the jurisdiction includes that of a youth court).
---	--

The Department noted the comments made by one respondent in connection with the need for a “child-focussed” approach to consideration of offences committed by young people.

The Department is keenly aware of the [UN Convention on the Rights of a Child](#), and the ongoing work of the Isle of Man Government to ensure that children’s rights are at the heart of decision making processes, in alignment with the Government’s [Child First policy](#).

The [Justice Reform Act 2021 as passed](#), introduced changes to the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court, to deal with those aged under 18 years (rather than under 17 years as is the case presently). The Juvenile Court is also to be renamed the Youth Court. These changes, and the additional changes set out in the JRAB are intended to balance against a core principle, that wherever possible, sees young people appropriately diverted away from the Criminal Justice System ([which aligns with the Convention of the Rights of a Child, and in particular Article 37\(b\) of that convention](#)).

Fresh alternative disposals, such as Youth Conditional Cautions, were also included within the [Justice Reform Act 2021](#)<sup>6</sup>, and wider consideration of existing disposals is ongoing<sup>7</sup>.

The overarching impacts of the proposed changes to the procedure of the Youth Courts are illustrated in an infographic (which was originally found within page 29 [of the Consultation](#)). The Department proposes to continue to progress these changes, with minor amendments identified during the consultation period.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Part 6 of the [Justice Reform Act 2021](#)<sup>v</sup>, which deals with youth cautions.

<sup>7</sup> Including the Youth Justice Targeted Operating Model planning which can be referred to in the latest [Department Plan 2025/26](#).

## Impact of the corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the **JUVENILE COURTS/YOUTH COURTS**

### Current Day

#### Summary Jurisdiction Act 1989

Establishes a separate Summary Court – the Juvenile Court.

Jurisdiction of the Juvenile Courts is restricted to dealing with those under 17 years of age.

Certain offences must be committed to the Court of General Gaol Delivery i.e. Sexual Offences, murder, offences that would attract more than 14 years adult penalty when committed by a person over 14 years of age, any offence charged jointly with a person aged 17 or over.

### Justice Reform Act 2021

#### Amends Summary Jurisdiction Act 1989

Changes the title of the Juvenile Courts to the Youth Courts and extends their jurisdiction to those under 18 years of age.

When the High Bailiff is presiding over a Youth Court, it can try information only offences that would be punishable, in the case of an adult, with no more than 2 years' custody. Fines in the Youth Courts are capped at level 4 on the standard scale.

Certain offences must be sent to the Court of General Gaol Delivery i.e. murder or treason or offences that would be punishable, in the case of an adult, with more than 2 years' custody, complex fraud cases, offences with licensing requirements (under s.38 of CJA2001 for sexual or violent offence) or any sexual offences, and any offence charged jointly with a person over 18 years of age (that is sent to Court of General Gaol Delivery).

### Justice Reform (Amendment) Bill 2025

Further amends the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1989 (as amended by the Justice Reform Act 2021).

Further extends the jurisdiction of the Youth Courts to try information only offences (including when the High Bailiff is not presiding) where the maximum sentence is 2 years and an unlimited fine.

Changes proposed mean that the only offences that must be sent to the Court of General Gaol Delivery become murder/treason, offences that would be punishable in the case of an adult with more than 2 years' custody, complex or serious fraud cases, offences with extended licensing requirements (under s.38 of CJA2001 for sexual or violent offence). Better carrying through these policy aims as settled in the Justice Reform Act 2021

In the case of a "joint count", a change is proposed to allow that a young person can plead before a Summary Court, and if they enter a guilty plea can be sent to either Court of General Gaol Delivery or the Youth Court for sentencing. Again, better carrying through these policy aims as settled in the Justice Reform Act 2021

**5.3 - Section 7.4 of the Consultation relates to Other fresh changes or improvements to the procedure of the Summary Courts (COSJ) or Court of General Gaol Delivery (CGGD), or changes that support the operation and administration of the Criminal Justice System.**

**Question 3:**

**We asked:**

Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed changes made in connection with Rules of Court, live links or electronic transactions as set out in Change / improvement number 1 and 2 of Section 7.4?

**You said:**

There were a total of **2** responses received to this question.

Both responses were supportive and recognised the importance of moving away from “paper-based” processes and towards more modern digital approach, whilst recognising that more broadly Data Protection would need to be considered within these fresh processes.

**We did:**

The Department has carefully considered the small number of responses submitted to this question and as no strong case for amendment was made, the Department proposes to progress with the policy approach set out in the JRAB.

It is noted that, if the JRAB should successfully pass, fresh implementation planning will be undertaken to consider timelines to commence the Justice Reform Act 2021 (as amended by the JRAB).

This planning will involve key stakeholders from across the Criminal Justice System and take account of a range of deliverables that need to be in place prior to commencement.

This will include updated Rules of Court taking account of fresh matters provided for by the Justice Reform Act 2021 (as amended by the JRAB).

Additionally, process mapping by agencies that support the Criminal Justice System will be needed to ensure that the appropriate information sharing gateways are in place.

**Question 4:**

**We asked:**

Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed changes in connection with the sending process (s.18 to proposed new s.18I of SJA1989) as set out in Change / improvement number 3 through to 6 of Section 7.4?

## You said:

There were a total of **3** responses received to this question.

The responses were supportive of the changes in relation to the sending process, set out at [section 18 to new 18I of the SJA1989 \(as proposed to be amended\)](#).

Three points were raised by separate respondents regarding consideration of future proofing social media for AI and broader technology advancement related to reporting restrictions, a repeated request to ensure that there are appropriate “child-focussed” processes in place when dealing with young people, and comments around the planning that would be needed support implementation of the “sending process”.

## We did:

Given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed changes in connection with the sending process (s.18 to proposed new s.18I of SJA1989), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

Additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period has identified further matters which have been considered. Taking account of this feedback some redrafting has been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill.

This includes:

Change and rationale for change	Section of the SJA1989 impacted
<p>Guilty pleas, introduction of previous convictions of the accused by section 18(2)(a) of the SJA1989. This differs from the present approach where prior convictions are only considered if the accused indicates a guilty plea.</p> <p>Therefore, the wording at 18(2) (a) where the prosecutor informs the court of prior convictions, as part of the decision as to venue (court where the case will be tried) is problematic as the Court will then receive information about previous convictions, despite those convictions possibly being inadmissible at trial (not relevant to the matter in hand). This potentially necessitates some form of alternate panel considering the matter in hand, as the Court would already be aware of the convictions under the process required by 18(2)(a)</p> <p>Within the “normal” process of the Court, opportunities to present prior convictions exist, as part of the argument of a case (<a href="#">such as evidence of “bad character” under the Criminal Evidence Act 2019, in line with the associated Order made under section 9(4)(b)</a>), and any considerations prior to a judgement being passed down.</p> <p>Therefore, the wording of this subsection has been adjusted to remove the reference to presentation of prior convictions and replace with “the facts giving rise to the offence”.</p>	18(2)(a)

Additionally, as set out above in connection with section 7.2 of the Consultation, changes have been made to ensure that the overarching change brought by the new section 1A of the SJA1989, in relation to the extended jurisdiction of the Summary Courts, and the impact around “information only” or “either way” offences is harmonised.

Should the JRAB successfully pass, implementation planning will be undertaken to consider timelines to commence the Justice Reform Act 2021 (as amended by the JRAB). This planning will involve key stakeholders from across the Criminal Justice System and take account of a range of deliverables that need to be in place prior to commencement.

This will include consideration of the overall timelines and actions required for the fresh “sending” process, and any of the process mapping by the agencies that support the Criminal Justice System, to ensure successful implementation of these new timelines.

### **Question 5:**

#### **We Asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed additional enhancements to the SJA1989 as set out in Change / improvement number 7 through to 14 of Section 7.4?

#### **You said:**

There were a total of **3** responses received to this question.

The responses received were supportive in relation to the proposed additional enhancements to the [SJA1989 \(as proposed to be amended\)](#), and in particular, one respondent noted the positive likely impact of the changes to the jurisdiction of the summary courts in relation to maritime offences.

#### **We did: -**

The Department has carefully considered the small number of responses submitted to this question and as no strong case for amendment was made, the Department proposes to progress with the policy approach set out in the JRAB.

Additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period has identified further matters which have been considered. Taking account of this feedback some redrafting has been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill.

This includes:

<b>Change and rationale for change</b>	<b>Section of the SJA1989 impacted</b>
Period of effectivity for Deferment Orders – adjustment to 12 months rather than 6 months.  The extension of duration is reflective of the work involved in ensuring that the individual made subject to the Order might engage fully with the requirements of that	23A (2)



<p>Order, for a reasonable duration, thereby achieving the best possible outcome as a result of that fresh process.</p> <p>Generally, the insertion of the fresh section 23A in the SJA1989, in respect of deferment of sentencing, will facilitate the use of problem-solving courts<sup>8</sup> on Island in the near future and is supported by a workstream of the <a href="#">Criminal Justice Board</a>, that will be prioritised in 2026 (subject to the successful progression of the JRAB, and the subsequent availability of Deferment Orders).</p>	
<p>Section 32 of the SJA1989 in relation to Corporations was noted as potentially lacking in clarity as to the court procedures that apply i.e. if allocation procedures apply (and the general applicability of sections 15A, 15B or 18 to corporations). A small amendment “for the avoidance of doubt” has been incorporated.</p>	32
<p>The original insertion of this section between two provisions concerning re-opening cases was noted to be confusing. The content itself was not at issue – just location in the “flow” of the SJA1989.</p> <p>Therefore, this section has been relocated and will be inserted as section 18J of the SJA1989.</p>	section 33ZA / new section 18J
<p>In respect of the changes proposed in the Consultation version of the JRAB intended to provide that "mixed decision" costs orders can be made in connection with civil matters, additional amendment to this section was suggested during the consultation period, as the interplay of the proposed subsection (1) and (1A) were potentially contradictory, with (1) relating to outcome in a “set manner” more generally while (1A) focussed on discretion in “domestic proceedings”.</p> <p>To give a clear blanket discretion for the Courts to make “mixed decision” outcomes in Civil Matters (not limited to “domestic proceedings only” and to provide for variation around periodic payments orders (and their enforcement), additional changes to section 47 of the SJA1989 have been proposed and will form part of the finalised JRAB.</p> <p>For clarity it is noted that decisions regarding costs in Criminal Proceedings will fall to Part 5 of the Justice Reform Act 2021 (once commenced), and sections 28, 29 and 107 of SJA 1989 and 48 to 53 of CJA 1993 (in respect of costs), are to be repealed (by section 50 of the Justice Reform Act 2021, which is contained within Part 5 of that Act: <i>Costs in criminal proceedings</i>).</p>	47(1), 47(1A)
<p>Ref prohibition of cross examination in relation to “family proceedings” (that will be introduced within <a href="#">sections 53A to 53G of the SJA1989</a>, by <a href="#">Part 4 of the Domestic Abuse Act 2020</a>). Further harmonisation of these provisions, in relation to “domestic proceedings”, to fully align with definitions adjusted within section 48 of the SJA1989 (once amended by the Domestic Abuse Act 2020) has been proposed.</p>	48, 53B to 53F

<sup>8</sup> A small change is proposed to the SJA1989, to insert a fresh s.23A in respect of deferment of sentencing to seek to facilitate the use of problem-solving courts on Island in the near future

<p>Additionally, the addition of power to amend section 48 SJA1989 by instrument, after consultation with the Deemsters, to future proof this approach has also been proposed.</p> <p>Whilst captured here as ultimately the impact is to the SJA1989 – this change is made by clause 67 in relation to the Domestic Abuse Act 2020 (see Question 22).</p>	
<p>Minor technical adjustments:</p> <p>With reference to section 76(4) SJA1989, the purpose of the stray words “or a person authorised by the witness” were noted to be contradictory as there is no witness.</p> <p>Section 103 SJA1989, it was noted that the division of the High Court was not specified and should refer to the Appeal Division.</p> <p>The wording at section 76(4) is to be removed and section 103 corrected to refer to the Appeal Division.</p>	76(4) and 103

### **Question 6:**

#### **We Asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed enhancements to the Criminal Jurisdiction Act 1993 (CJA1993), the High Court Act 1991, or Part 5 of the Justice Reform Act 2021 as set out in Change / improvement number 15 through to 19 of Section 7.4?

#### **You said:**

There were a total of **3** responses received to this question.

Respondents were content or neutral. Substantive concerns were not raised although there were a small number of suggested technical changes to the proposed draft provisions for consistency (to improve their operability).

#### **We did:**

Given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [SJA1989 \(shown as amended\)](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

Additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period has identified further matters which have been considered. Taking account of this feedback some redrafting has been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill.

Noting feedback on terminology, changes responding to technical points on consistency of terminology raised by respondents are also included.

Change and rationale for change	Section of CJA1993 / HCA1991 impacted
<p>The need to harmonise the statutory power to summon witnesses to the Court of General Gaol Delivery beyond inherent jurisdiction. Such a provision exists for a Summary Court (within section 59 SJA1989) and is to be introduced at section 33B of the High Court Act 1991 (by the JRAB), so full harmonisation would be practical.</p> <p>A new section 13A is proposed to be inserted within the CJA1993 and will contain wording that broadly follows that in section 59 of the SJA1989 (and in the new section 33B of the HCA1991).</p>	new 13A CJA1993
<p>References to "a justice" which appear in paragraphs 4 and 5 of Schedule A1 of the CJA1993 require technical correction to harmonise with the Court in which they will operate and are proposed to be amended to "a Deemster". The applicability of these paragraphs of Schedule A1 is signposted by section 18I of the SJA1989.</p>	CJA1993, Schedule A1 (paragraphs 4 and 5)
<p>A reference to a "justice" is made within section 33B of the HCA1991 that requires to be harmonised to refer to "a judge".</p>	HCA1991, section 33B
<p>The aim behind the amendments to section 57 of the HCA1991 was to reintroduce the ability of the Chief Registrar to remit or defer fees in cases of exceptional hardship, a discretionary power that was exercised in the not too distant past<sup>9</sup>.</p> <p>Further discussion during the consultation period has given rise to the proposal to insert a new sub-section 57(5) within the HCA1991 with a mandatory requirement for the Chief Registrar to publish guidance as to the circumstances when the court will exercise discretion. Additionally, slight amendment to the foregoing subsections is also proposed.</p> <p>This change relates solely to fees payable to the Courts, however there is a certain overlap in relation to matters where hardship might arise e.g. Domestic Abuse, and as such this is noted as a proposed positive change within the wider Criminal Justice System approach to dealing with applicants to court processes (see Question 22).</p>	new subsection 57(5) HCA1991

<sup>9</sup> The [Court Service Fees Order 2021](#) contained a discretionary element under Article 4(2) of that Order. The subsequent [Order made in 2023](#) removed the blanket discretion and replaced this with a fresh approach (in which fees were means tested etc.) which is the approach that has continued until the present day – [as per the most recent 2025 Order](#). This means that (outside of that set out in the Order) the discretion rest on financial consideration only and is the practice which is not reflective of all possible scenarios – including (for example) a mechanism to consider those who are the victims of domestic financial abuse.

## **Question 7:**

### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed enhancements to the Criminal Law Act 1981 or Bail Act 1952 as set out in Change / improvement number 20 and 21 of Section 7.4?

### **You said:**

There were a total of **3** responses received to this question.

Respondents were content or neutral. Substantive concerns were not raised although there were a small number of suggested technical changes to the proposed changes to the [Criminal Law Act 1981 \(shown as amended\)](#) or the [Bail Act 1952 \(shown as amended\)](#) (to improve their operability).

### **We did:**

The Department has carefully considered the small number of responses submitted to this question and as no strong case for amendment was made, the Department proposes to progress with the policy approach set out in the JRAB.

Certain redrafting changes have been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill, taking account of any additional matters identified, following additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period.

At present, regarding the Bail Act 1952, these relate solely to minor typographical or cross referencing changes save for two changes identified in respect of technical matters that can be referred to within the [Bail Act 1952 as amended consultation version](#) as follows:

- 1) At subsection 3A(2)(b) removal of the wording "has failed to surrender to custody" as these are obviated by the wording found elsewhere at subsection (2) – in essence it's a duplication of wording; and,
- 2) At subsection 3C(10) insertion of a reference to "Tynwald Day" as a day on which the Summary Courts are not held (the better to align with [section 49\(6\) of the PPPA1998](#)).

In relation to the Criminal Law Act 1981, no redrafting changes have been identified at this time.

## **Question 8:**

### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed general harmonisation or technical changes within the JRAB? Examples are set out within Change / improvement number 22 and 23.

### **You said:**

There were a total of **2** responses received to this question.

Substantive concerns were not raised with one respondent generally content and the other highlighting references to “Her Majesty” and the “juvenile courts” in some places for consideration.

### **We did:**

Noting the feedback in relation to proposed general harmonisation or technical changes within the JRAB, the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes.

## **5.4 - Section 7.5 of the Consultation relates to Fresh changes in other key policy areas**

### **Question 9:**

#### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the s.19 of the Criminal Code 1872 as set out in Change number 1 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said:**

There were a total of **7** responses received to this question.

Respondents to this question expressed views in relation to proposed changes to [section 19 of the Criminal Code 1872](#)) relating to conspiracy or solicitation to commit murder, as well as more general points of the broader legislation.

Comments were predominantly positive, recognising the value of an increase in relation to such a serious offence, and generally the notion of harmony for “inchoate” offences.

One respondent repeated their concern at the expanded jurisdiction of the Summary Courts.

#### **We did:**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation on the proposed changes to section 19 of the Criminal Code 1872, the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

Additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period has identified further matters which have been considered. Taking account of this feedback some redrafting ([impacting the Criminal Code 1872 more generally](#)) has been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill.

This includes:

Change and rationale for change	Section of CC1872 impacted
<p>At section 36(1) of the Criminal Code 1872 – within the present drafting the use of the word ‘and’ between 36(1)(a) where the intention within the offence is stated, and 36(1)(b) the recklessness statement within the offence was identified as problematic and giving rise to an unintended consequence that, when read literally, meant that a defence to the offence would be to say that a Defendant wasn’t reckless they always had an intention to commit the act. This section has been amended with redrafted wording to remove this conflict.</p>	<p>Section 36</p>
<p>At section 320 of the CC1872 an Escaping custody offence exists which to a degree overlaps with section 4 of the Custody Act 1995 (where a separate but similar offence of assisting or harbouring a person who has escaped custody is found).</p> <p>Additionally, at section 319 of the CC1872, there is a separate offence of Neglecting to execute any writ, etc, or permitting any person to be at large who ought to be arrested.</p> <p>Presently sections 319 and 320 of the CC1872 are bound by a connected misdemeanour penalty clause found at section 321 of the CC1872, which gives rise to imprisonment not exceeding 2 years.</p> <p>The penalty for the offence at section 4(1) of the Custody Act 1995, in respect of assisting an escape, is presently stated to be conviction on information, to custody for a term not exceeding 5 years. While the offence of knowingly harbouring or assisting an escapee, presently has an on information penalty of a term not exceeding 2 years or to a fine (or both), or a summary penalty of a term not exceeding 6 months, a level 5 fine (or both). The present amendments found within the JRA2021 as passed, see the section 4(1) penalty and the section 4(2) penalty both become: Maximum penalty (summary) 2 years’ custody and a fine.</p> <p>On review, this appears to be an artificial lowering of the section 4(1) penalty, and while section 4(2) penalty and the CC1872 “misdemeanour” penalty are not substantially altered, in practice neither are in keeping with the severity of the offence, or indeed with the much more substantial penalties in neighbouring jurisdictions<sup>10</sup>.</p> <p>Therefore, it is proposed that a harmonisation be made to see all offences aligned to one penalty approach, that of the present section 4(1) offence of the Custody Act 1995, meaning the penalty for all above mentioned matters is a <i>Maximum penalty (on information) — 5 years’ custody and a fine</i>.</p> <p>Summary trial of such offences will be possible under the combined JRA2021/JRAB changes and will default to a maximum penalty as set out in section 1A of the SJA1989 (a term not exceeding 2 years and/or a fine).</p>	<p>Section 319, 320 and 321 (with cross reference to the Custody Act 1995 – Question 16)</p>

<sup>10</sup> For example, [section 39 of the Prison Act 1952 \(an Act of Parliament\)](#) sees the offence of assisting / facilitating an escape carrying a penalty of [10 years](#).

More broadly, feedback from respondents will be noted for additional consideration alongside the Department's planned Sentencing Bill, which it is intended will be developed in the next legislative period.

This is intended to review existing methods of disposal including sentences that can be handed down for existing offences and any current alternatives to custody – such as “community orders”<sup>11</sup> – as well as considering the modernisation and harmonisation of the Island's laws in these areas. This approach has been successfully adopted in England and Wales, where the [Sentencing Act 2020 \(an Act of Parliament\)](#), sets out a consolidated approach to sentencing.

### **Question 10:**

#### **We asked: -**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Firearms Act 1947 as set out in Change number 2 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **22** responses received to this question.

From the feedback received, the majority of the respondents were not in favour of the proposed changes to the Firearms Act 1947 ([found at clause 54 of the JRAB](#)) which would see a [fresh section 30A inserted within that Act](#) providing that Statutory Guidance could be issued by the Department, for the purposes of that Act, to which the Chief Constable must have regard when exercising their functions under that Act, and to which the High Bailiff must have regard (if relevant to any appeal heard under that Act).

Overall, responses reflected a mix of concerns about fairness, practicality and the wider impact on the Island's approach to firearms regulation as a result of the Guidance and the changes it might bring.

Where support was expressed, it focused on measures that improve public safety. Several respondents welcomed stronger checks in cases involving domestic abuse and agreed this should be a valid reason to refuse a firearms certificate. There was also recognition that Statutory Guidance could help prevent individuals with serious mental health conditions from holding firearms licences. These points were seen as positive steps toward protecting the community.

However, a common theme was the perceived lack of consultation with the [Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee](#), which some felt undermined transparency and fairness. The timing of the proposal, coinciding with licence renewals, was also questioned, and the fact that such Guidance would be made without formal need to consult with the Committee (only consultation with the Chief Constable is mandate in the draft JRAB).

There was opposition to adopting UK-style practices. Respondents felt measures such as mandatory partner interviews, compulsory GP medical certificates and social media checks were not suited to the Isle of Man. Cost was another concern for respondents, with medical certification potentially adding what respondents described as a significant expense for applicants. Many respondents also stressed the importance of preserving the Island's distinct firearms framework, which the respondents felt was proportionate and effective.

---

<sup>11</sup> most of which are set out in the list of “community orders” found within section 47 of the [Criminal Justice, Police and Courts Act 2007](#)



Practical challenges were highlighted by respondents who stated that revised licensing procedures would in their view be needed to support fresh processes, and respondents felt that a clarity on the role of medical professionals within any areas set out in Guidance would need to be established. Respondents were also of the view that these changes could increase administrative burdens and create uncertainty in decision-making processes.

Overall, the tone of responses was largely critical. There was a strong preference from respondents to keep to the current system, avoiding UK-style guidance and suggesting that the core required approach was one of detailed engagement with key stakeholders.

#### **We did: -**

This consultation area, alongside the linked consultation area in respect to the Shotguns, Air Weapons and Cross-bows Act 1994 (set out in connection with Question 15 found on page 29), received the greatest level of consultation responses.

The majority of these responses did not favour the changes and expressed concerns in relation to the perceived lack of engagement with the [Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee](#), privacy concerns about the operation of the Guidance, and the role of the police in that operation.

The proposal to provide for Statutory Guidance is the Department's response to a Tynwald recommendation. This recommendation was made by [Tynwald Social Affairs Policy Review Committee \("SAPRC"\) Report on Mental Health and Suicide](#) which was debated in Tynwald in January 2020. Recommendation 7 from within the SAPRC report which was agreed by [Council of Ministers in their response to the SAPRC report](#), and also approved by a Tynwald motion<sup>12</sup> was:

*"That the Department of Home Affairs and Department of Health and Social Care review methods of restricting mentally disordered persons from holding firearm licences where it would be a safety risk for such a person to do so."*

The Department remains committed to a full review and modernisation of the legislation relating to firearms but unfortunately the policy consultation work in this area, through engagement with the Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee, has been delayed at this time (as set out in the [2025–2026 Department Plan](#)).

In light of this, the Department proposed these stand-alone amendments to the Firearms Act 1947 and the Shotguns, Air Weapons and Cross-bows Act 1994, which would provide for some additional actions (within the present legislative framework for firearms etc), that will support compliance with the Tynwald recommendation, and most importantly, provide that there is a mechanism to support that those with access to firearms may be subject to a suitability assessment in regard to health matters and other concerns.

The Statutory Guidance which exists in England and Wales, is the mechanism through which this review takes place in that jurisdiction, in line with police involvement in that process and wider operational involvement such as that of medical professionals. This model has been in place for some time in England and Wales and was considered as the "best practice" approach that might be adopted on Island in the meantime (before the full consultation on a new firearms framework commences).

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.tynwald.org.im/business/hansard/20002020/t200122.pdf> Page 995 T137 line 1474



Firearms licensing falls to a triennial (every three years) licensing process, with an upcoming triennial period occurring in April 2026. One concern raised was that the proposed application of Statutory Guidance would be in place by April 2026. That is not possible given the timescales involved in progressing the JRAB.

The timescales for progressing the JRAB and subsequent formulation of the Statutory Guidance (which will be subject to statutory consultation with the Chief Constable and, following the post consultation change to the JRAB, the Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee) will extend beyond the April 2026 licensing process. It is not the case that changes have been planned to correspond to the licensing renewal period. There is no intention to bring in changes before April 2026. Furthermore, other key stakeholders will need to be engaged to ensure that any matters addressed by Guidance have the necessary operational details in place to support them and to ensure successful compliance with Guidance is possible for all parties.

The Department notes that within the dissatisfaction expressed by respondents to the consultation, this has included comments from the Membership of the Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee who state that the changes were not explored with that Committee prior to consultation. While the Department regrets any disappointment or confusion with the proposals included in the JRAB, the Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee meetings have covered relevant topics including this matter in Committee meetings prior to the consultation. The Department wrote to the Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee in September 2025 highlighting the proposed provision for Statutory Guidance in the JRAB and inviting the membership of the Committee to participate in the consultation. The Department thanks the Committee members for their candid responses and will shortly meet with the Committee to discuss these points, and to hear more on these concerns.

The Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee was initially to be reconvened prior to the Covid-19 pandemic. This began with the bringing together of former members of the Committee on the 03 February 2020, to discuss a planned formal recruitment cycle to reconvene the Committee as a representative stakeholder engagement platform, to consider the policy that would underpin the new Firearms legislation.

Among the matters discussed at the 2020 meeting, mental health and more broadly, physical health and the approach taken in England and Wales around firearms certification were touched on, and the (at that time very recent) SAPRC Report and its recommendation in respect of mentally disordered persons and access to firearms. Additionally, going into the formal recruitment exercise, it was noted that the fresh Committee would (among core agencies represented on a standing basis, such as the Department and the Police) include a standing representative from Mental Health Services. This was viewed as important as issues such as suicide and access to firearms by those who become mentally disordered, were all existing concerns.

Following a delay in recruitment finalisation as a result of the Covid-19 period, the Committee reconvened on 27 June 2024, with a mandate to establish policy for the new Firearms licensing framework, in order that a policy consultation could take place (which was planned for 2025 and has unfortunately been delayed, as set out in the [2025–2026 Department Plan](#)).

Access to firearms and concerns around this, of access by mentally disordered persons, and in particular suicides as a result of this, have been a theme for discussion throughout the life of the Committee to date. This crystallised around the SAPRC recommendation which was deemed by the Department to be of such significant importance, that progression within the JRAB appeared pragmatic now (given the delay in the wider firearms framework progression, as set out in the [2025–2026 Department Plan](#)). This proposed change

would mean that something could begin to be done with regard to the recommendation, that cannot otherwise be addressed under the present outdated legislation without wider reform.

A meeting of the Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee will shortly be scheduled, and the feedback to this consultation will be discussed with Committee Members, and more heard on their concerns. More generally, the engagement of the Committee in developing a future Statutory Guidance will be key.

At this time the Department still intends to progress the changes set out in relation to the Firearms Act 1947 and the Shotguns, Air Weapons and Cross-bows Act 1994. Whilst the Department notes the concerns of the respondents, the Department believes the long term benefits to public safety outweigh the concerns of the respondents.

To take account of feedback, a change has been made to the Bill, to formalise the requirement for statutory consultation with the Firearms Licensing Consultative Committee prior to Guidance being issued. This will supplement the existing proposed requirement ([in the consultation version of the JRAB amendments](#)) to consult the Chief Constable.

### **Question 11:**

#### **We asked: -**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Criminal Justice Act 1963 as set out in Change number 3 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **4** responses received to this question.

Responses to the proposed change were either supportive or, neutral.

Overall, the principle of modernising and updating the law was supported, along with any change that enhances the ability to hear “the voice of the victim” as part of stakeholder processes under the Criminal Justice System.

One respondent cautioned that (in their view) technical amendments shouldn’t be used to introduce larger policy shifts without proper consultation and scrutiny. One respondent repeated their objection to the expanded jurisdiction of the Summary Courts while recognising the intention of tidying up procedural references.

#### **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Criminal Justice Act 1963](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

## **Question 12:**

### **We asked: -**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Jury Act 1980 as set out in Change number 4 of Section 7.5?

### **You said: -**

There were a total of **4** responses received to this question.

Responses to the proposed change were balanced between those which were positive and those which expressed concerns in some areas.

The areas on which concern were expressed included the right to trial by jury which the respondents viewed as more than a procedural step, and an important part of Manx justice. Similar concerns to those noted in respect of section 7.2 (and set out above, in connection with Question 1).

### **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Jury Act 1980](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents. As noted in the response to Question 1 above, aside from fraud, jury tampering and defendant request, CGGD trials will continue to be way of trial by jury.

Additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period has identified further matters which have been considered. Taking account of this feedback some redrafting has been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill.

This includes:

<b>Change and rationale for change</b>	<b>Section of Jury Act 1980 impacted</b>
Ability to retain alternate jurors until the end of the opening speech for the prosecution, to flush out additional issues that otherwise may lead to collapsed trials, for example where a juror realised that they do have some conflict that means they cannot continue as a juror.  A new subsection 26(11) will be included within the Jury Act 1980 to provide that Rules of Court may make provision for this.	26(11)
Forced trial continuance falling to section 28 of the Jury Act 1980 - this section forces a trial to continue if a member of the jury is discharged. <a href="#">Amendments proposed in the JRAB consultation version</a> remove this from the control of the parties, however, this also means that (as a consequence of this) the Deemster now has no say on the matter – nor the parties.	28

Therefore, to allow some additional flexibility around such an instance, section 28 is proposed to be further amended to indicate that: <i>unless the Deemster considers otherwise</i> , the jury shall be considered as remaining for all the purposes of that trial properly constituted, and the trial shall proceed, and a verdict may be given accordingly.	
--	--

### **Question 13:**

#### **We asked: -**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Legal Practitioners Act 1986? [see page 40 of the consultation document for details]

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **4** responses received to this question.

Respondents welcomed the proposed amendments to the Legal Practitioners Act 1986, designed to strengthen oversight of immigration advisors, recognising this as an important step in maintaining standards and protecting individuals seeking advice.

#### **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Legal Practitioners Act 1986](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

It is also noted that the Legal Practitioners Act 1986, is a shared policy area between [the Department for Enterprise \(falling as it does to the administration of the Central Registry, under the responsibilities of the Registrar General\)](#) and the Department in bringing forward these amendments within the JRAB.

### **Question 14:**

#### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Criminal Justice Act 1991 as set out in Change number 8 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **5** responses received to this question (albeit it was noted that several of these responses appeared to relate to change number 9 – and were in fact in relation to firearms rather than computer evidence).

The two responses clearly in respect of this proposed change were both neutral.

### **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Criminal Justice Act 1991](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

### **Question 15:**

#### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Shotguns, Air Weapons and Crossbows Act 1994 as set out in Change number 9 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **14** responses received to this question.

Responses to this proposal were in the main negative and outlined concerns that mirrored those expressed in regard to the proposals related to the Firearms Act 1947 – all of which are set out in connection with Question 10 and can be found on page 23 of this Summary.

### **We did: -**

The approach that the Department intends to take is that set out in the We did section in relation to Question 10 and can be found on page 23 of this Summary

### **Question 16:**

#### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Custody Act 1995 as set out in Change number 10 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **4** responses received to this question.

Responses were supportive in principle. Most agreed that the Custody Act 1995 needs modernisation to improve custody management and ensure conditions that are secure, humane and conducive to rehabilitation where appropriate but do not compromise public safety. Other matters such as electronic monitoring were also supported, with views that they enhanced victim confidence (and safety). Youth custody was also mentioned by one respondent expressing the view that young people who commit serious offences should face consequences for their actions, appropriate to the circumstances.

While recognising the need for reform, respondents emphasised (more broadly) that any changes must protect victims and ensure serious offences are dealt with appropriately.

## **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Custody Act 1995](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

Certain redrafting changes have been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill, taking account of any additional matters identified, following additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period.

These include changes in relation the penalties associated with the offence of escaping from custody, found within the Criminal Code 1872, and a harmonisation of that change, with that in relation to the offences of assisting an escape from custody or harbouring an escapee, which are found [at section 4 of the Custody Act 1995](#). The full detail surrounding these changes can be referred to in connection with Question 9 and can be found on page 21 of this Summary.

A more detailed review of the Custody Act 1995 forms part of the Department's ongoing work streams in relation to the modernisation and improvement of the Island's Criminal Justice System and the legislation that system rests upon. In the future, further legislative change will likely follow and see broader modernisation of the Custody Act 1995.

## **Question 17:**

### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Police Powers and Procedures Act 1998 as set out in Change number 11 of Section 7.5?

### **You said: -**

There were a total of **5** responses received to this question.

Amongst the small number of responses, differing perspectives were put forward. Broadly changes that support improved policing efficiency were welcomed. Concerns were expressed by some on the broader implications of expanded police powers particularly in relation to detaining young people (for questioning). Overall, respondents wanted to see a balance between effective policing and suitable safeguards for the rights of those within police detention (and in particular, young people if the proposed changes were progressed).

Respondents were in favour of amendments that align search records and fingerprinting with the [Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 \(an Act of Parliament\)](#) of England and Wales. These changes were seen as helpful for improving clarity and consistency.

Other more general comments were made regarding provisions allowing the prosecution to discontinue proceedings (not specifically in relation to the present proposals but discontinued proceedings are referred to as a reason why, for example, fingerprint records might be destroyed/not retained). Respondents urged that any discontinuance (more generally as this happens) must be transparently justified and allow victims to seek review. Weak cases involving stalking or harassment were highlighted as examples where discontinuance could put victims at risk.

## **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Police Powers and Procedures Act 1998](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

Naturally, children will remain in a custodial setting for as limited a duration as possible, and whilst in custody certain key steps will be taken by the Custody Officer (police officer in charge of police custody), to ensure that the person responsible for the child is contacted (and other key requirements under either PPPA1998 or Children and Young Persons Act 2001, [which include those under the Codes of Practice that supplement PPPA1998](#), and more broadly in relation to the compliance requirements of the [UN Convention on the Rights of Child](#)).

## **Question 18:**

### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Protection from Harassment Act 2000? [see page 48 of the consultation document for details]

### **You said: -**

There were a total of **3** responses received to this question.

Responses to this part of the consultation were strongly supportive of the changes to the [Protection from Harassment Act 2000](#). Many commended the proposed amendments as an important step toward strengthening protections for people experiencing harassment and stalking. Contributors emphasised the serious psychological harm these offences cause and the need for a justice system that responds swiftly, robustly and compassionately to victims.

Respondents stressed that harassment and stalking are insidious crimes that often escalate if not addressed early. There was strong support for enabling victims to obtain protection orders quickly and without excessive evidential burdens. Several argued that the justice system must prioritise early intervention and ensure victims are not left vulnerable due to procedural delays or high thresholds for proof. The importance of treating cumulative patterns of behaviour as legitimate grounds for prosecution was also highlighted.

Respondents cautioned against dismissing cases with “weak evidence” where the overall impact on the victim is severe, noting that harassment often manifests through repeated, individually minor acts that collectively cause significant harm.

There was clear support for serious penalties for breaches of protection orders and for cases of sustained harassment. Respondents advocated for custodial sentences where appropriate and called for summary courts to be fully equipped to impose meaningful consequences. The expanded powers of summary courts were welcomed in principle, provided they are matched by adequate training and procedural safeguards.

Innovative approaches to enforcement were also suggested, including community-based monitoring systems and new technologies to support victims and track offenders. Respondents noted that the Isle of Man’s scale and infrastructure could support such developments and that the financial investment would be justified by the potential to prevent escalation and protect vulnerable individuals.

Victim support was another key theme. Respondents emphasised that victims must be genuinely heard and supported throughout legal proceedings. This includes access to information, emotional support and clear communication regarding their rights and the progress of their case. The amendments were seen as an opportunity to embed a more compassionate and responsive approach to victim care within the justice system.

The tone of responses was strongly supportive. Contributors urged that the Protection from Harassment Act 2000 becomes a model of victim-centred justice. They called for swift responses to harassment and stalking and emphasised the need for robust enforcement, procedural clarity and meaningful support for victims. The amendments were viewed as a vital step toward ensuring that the law works effectively for the Manx community and those it seeks to protect.

#### **We did: -**

The Department has carefully considered the small number of responses submitted to this question and as no strong case for amendment was made, the Department proposes to progress with the policy approach set out in the JRAB.

Certain redrafting changes have been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill, taking account of additional matters identified, following additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period.

These include a technical harmonisation change in relation to the penalty for the proposed fresh offence at section 4B, that of committing a section 4 or 4A offence outside of the Island (if the person accused of the offence is habitually resident on the Island), this penalty was noted to have inadvertently been omitted on consultation.

The penalty for the new 4B offences will be commensurate with that of sections 4 and 4A, namely: (on information) — 10 years' custody or a fine; (summary) — 12 months' custody or a level 5 fine.

#### **Question 19:**

#### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed change to the Human Rights Act 2001 or in respect of compatibility and remedial orders as set out in Change number 13 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **3** responses received to this question.

The responses were for the most part neutral, indicating an understanding of why the change was being proposed in relation to the scope of making of Remedial Orders, and ensuring that Manx legislation adheres to human rights.

One respondent did however note, here, and in other places throughout their consultation response, concerns about a general constitutional point which they objected to, namely that of the term "His Majesty" in the context of the Isle of Man. The respondent was of the view that the title "Lord of Mann" ought to more



generally be adopted, to recognise the distinct position the Isle of Man holds, as a self-governing Crown Dependency with our own distinct constitutional status.

#### **We did: -**

The Department has carefully considered the small number of responses submitted to this question and as no strong case for amendment was made, the Department proposes to progress with the policy approach set out in the JRAB.

#### **Question 20:**

#### **We asked:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Fireworks Act 2004 as set out in Change number 14 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **6** responses received to this question.

Responses to this question were mixed and for the most part were in connection with much broader themes beyond the consultation point (which focussed solely on two targeted amendments Fireworks Act 2004 that will address [recommendations 2 and 6 of the Select Committee of Tynwald on the Fireworks Act](#)). Those comments received solely in connection with the proposed changes were supportive.

More broadly, some respondents called for a complete ban on fireworks, citing safety and nuisance concerns, while others opposed tighter restrictions and argued for a more education-focused approach and that fireworks are an important part of cultural celebrations and should not be subject to restrictive regulation.

#### **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed changes to the [Fireworks Act 2004](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

As noted above, the changes themselves have been identified as a result of two Tynwald recommendations, [recommendations 2 and 6 of the Select Committee of Tynwald on the Fireworks Act](#), and the opportunity to bring forward these changes within the JRAB, and address these long standing recommendations has been taken.

Certain redrafting changes have been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill, taking account of any additional matters identified, following additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period.

These include feedback from the Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture, in relation to livestock, [where the proposed amendments to section 5 of the Fireworks Act 2004, by the JRAB](#), should be extended further to include reference to "livestock" in addition to domestic animals.

## **We asked:**

### **Question 21:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Criminal Justice, Police and Courts Act 2007?  
[see page 51 of the consultation document for details]

## **You said: -**

There were a total of **5** responses received to this question.

Responses to this part of the consultation were broadly supportive of the updates, especially with regard to the enhanced protections to be offered for victims (by the introduction of the prohibition on cross examination in court of complainants (victims), children and vulnerable witnesses in circumstances such as sexual offences matters).

Generally, victim-centred justice was viewed as important (and likely to be enhanced by the provisions that will aggravate offences where the victim's protected characteristics are presumed to be a factor in the motivation for the crime).

There was strong support for creating an aggravating factor for assaults on emergency and frontline workers, with respondents agreeing that violence against public servants should be met with firm sentencing responses.

## **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Criminal Justice, Police and Courts Act 2007](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

These amendments support the aims in the Criminal Justice Strategy to ensure victims and witnesses are placed at the heart of the Criminal Justice System. In particular, these amendments make provision to protect vulnerable victims and witnesses during proceedings.

Certain redrafting changes have been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill, taking account of any additional matters identified, following additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period.

These include a technical harmonisation change in relation to applicability of [Part 8A of the Act](#) to Tribunals held within Murray House. At present, Court Security Officers are in attendance at such Tribunals, but have no statutory powers in relation to them.

## **We asked:**

### **Question 22:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Domestic Abuse Act 2020 as set out in Change number 18 of Section 7.5?

## **You said: -**

There were a total of **4** responses received to this question.

Responses to this part of the consultation were strongly supportive. The proposed amendments were welcomed as a vital step toward strengthening protections for victims and enhancing enforcement powers. Overall, respondents called for the Isle of Man to adopt a clear zero-tolerance approach to domestic abuse, prioritising victim safety, robust sentencing and coordinated multi-agency action.

More broadly, victim support was identified by respondents as a critical priority. Respondents urged that victims be believed, protected and supported throughout proceedings and that the justice system avoid distressing individuals through insensitive processes. There was also a call for greater recognition of coercive control and patterns of abuse, even where individual incidents may appear minor. Protecting children who witness domestic abuse was highlighted as essential, with contributors noting that such children are victims in their own right.

There was a clear expectation that courts use their powers to impose meaningful consequences on perpetrators and uphold the safety and dignity of victims.

Overall, the tone of responses was unequivocally supportive. Contributors urged the Isle of Man to become a jurisdiction known for its strong stance against domestic abuse. The amendments were viewed as a vital step toward reinforcing the Island's commitment to protecting vulnerable individuals and ensuring justice for all.

## **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Domestic Abuse Act 2020](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

More generally, the ongoing work of the [Domestic Abuse Multi-Agency Forum](#) is noted as being key to continuing the momentum around Domestic Abuse related workstreams, following the successful implementation of Domestic Abuse Act 2020 ([on 04 January 2023](#)). The [Forum's Action Plan was updated earlier this year](#), and continues to feed into ongoing workstreams supported by the Department (as set out in the [Department Plan 2025/26](#)).

Domestic Abuse, public protection and violence against women and girls, are also noted to be key focus areas of the [Community Safety Partnership](#), operating under the supervision of the [Criminal Justice Board](#).

Certain redrafting changes have been incorporated within the finalised version of the Bill, taking account of any additional matters identified, following additional engagement with key stakeholders, during the consultation period.

These include changes set out in connection with Question 5 that can be found on page 16 of this Summary. These are further technical changes to ensure that the definition of “domestic proceedings” from which the protections from cross-examination stem within the SJA1989, are clear and harmonised.

Elsewhere within the JRAB, changes are brought that may be of key significance to those dealing with domestic abuse, including a change brought at section 57 of the HCA1991 (that can be referred to in connection with Question 6 found on page 18 of the Summary). This change relates solely to fees payable to the Courts, however there is a certain overlap in relation to matters where hardship might arise e.g. Domestic Abuse and more specifically financial abuse situations, and as such this is noted as a proposed positive change within the wider Criminal Justice System approach to dealing with applicants to court processes

#### **We asked:**

##### **Question 23:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Liquor Licensing and Public Entertainments Act 2021 as set out in Change number 19 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **3** responses received to this question.

Responses were generally supportive albeit limited in number. Most agreed that the proposed amendments are technical in nature and necessary to align procedural references with the reformed justice system. Some responses expressed the view that these updates must not introduce substantive changes to licensing policy without proper consultation.

On procedural alignment, respondents acknowledged that updates such as replacing references to “the High Bailiff” with “court of summary jurisdiction” are sensible. These changes were considered acceptable provided they do not alter licensing requirements, fees or application processes. Contributors emphasised that technical amendments should remain just that – technical - rather than being used as a vehicle for broader policy reform.

Licensing policy and its impact on businesses were key concerns. Those who commented highlighted the importance of maintaining a system that supports the hospitality and entertainment sectors, which are a vital part of the Island’s economy and community life. They called for transparent and consistently applied requirements, efficient application processing and a commitment to avoiding fee structures that act as revenue-raising mechanisms at the expense of small businesses.

Overall, respondents were supportive of the technical amendments. Contributors emphasised the need for a fair, transparent and efficient licensing system that supports the Island’s hospitality and entertainment industries. Any substantive changes to licensing policy should be subject to dedicated consultation and should not be introduced under the guise of administrative reform.

#### **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Liquor Licensing and Public Entertainments Act 2021](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

The Department is committed to the ongoing partnership working with the [Licensing Forum](#). The Forum continues to meet regularly and is noted to be a key statutory consultation partner for all licensing matters ([in accordance with section 59 of the Liquor Licensing and Public Entertainments Act 2021](#)).

#### **We asked:**

##### **Question 24:**

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Sexual Offences and Obscene Publications Act 2021 as set out in Change number 20 of Section 7.5?

#### **You said: -**

There were a total of **3** responses received to this question.

Responses to this part of the consultation were emphatically supportive.

More broadly respondents welcomed any amendment which strengthened enforcement, increased penalties and enhanced protections for victims. Contributors expressed views that sexual offences must be treated with the utmost severity and that victims, and the wider integrity of the justice system, must be safeguarded.

Victim support was also a wider theme. Respondents stressed that victims must be believed, protected, and treated with sensitivity throughout the justice process. There was a specific call for improved safeguards within healthcare settings, where vulnerable individuals may be retraumatised by inappropriate or dismissive treatment. Contributors recommended clear pathways for victims to request changes in medical personnel and accountability measures for professionals who fail to provide adequate care. Protecting children was highlighted as a non-negotiable priority, with respondents urging that sexual offences against children be prosecuted with absolute determination and carry the most severe penalties available, regardless of the offender's age.

There was strong support for holding youth offenders accountable for serious sexual crimes. Respondents argued that age should not shield individuals from meaningful consequences when the offence is particularly depraved.

Alongside advocating for severe penalties for genuine offenders, respondents also highlighted the need to address malicious false accusations. They stressed that justice must work both ways and that individuals who knowingly make false reports with intent to harm should face serious consequences. However, contributors were careful to distinguish between proven malicious falsehoods and cases where evidence is insufficient, or prosecution fails. Safeguards must be in place to protect genuine victims from being discouraged or discredited.

## **We did: -**

Generally, given the outcome of consultation in connection with proposed additional enhancements to the [Sexual Offences and Obscene Publications Act 2021](#), the Department proposes to continue to progress these changes and has carefully considered the comments of respondents.

Following the successful implementation of [Sexual Offences and Obscene Publications Act 2021](#) (on [25 March 2024](#)), workstreams in relation to Sexual Offences have continued to feed into ongoing workstreams supported by the Department (as set out in the [Department Plan 2025/26](#)).

These have included key matters such as the dedicated [Sexual Assault Referral Centre](#) which gives immediate clinical, psychological and practical support for sexual assault victims, as well as a modern forensic environment where evidence can be gathered to support the prosecution of sexual offenders

Additionally, with a more legislative focus, changes such as the issuance of the [Sexual Offences \(Sentencing Guideline - Indecent Photographs of Children\) \(Application\) Order 2025](#) that commenced on the 21 April 2025, have improved the efficiency of investigative processes. More detailed information about that Application Order, and the background to its progression, can be found [here](#).

## **5.5 - General feedback – JRAB**

### **We asked:**

#### **Question 25:**

Do you have any other comments in connection with the Justice Reform (Amendment) Bill?

### **You said: -**

There were a total of **9** responses received to this question.

Responses to this part of the consultation went beyond individual clauses and raised broader feedback about legislative scope, consultation processes and the cumulative impact of the proposed reforms.

Overall, the tone of responses was supportive of the Bill's intent to modernise the justice system but critical of its structure, consultation process and implementation planning. Respondents urged the Department to adopt a more transparent and thematically coherent approach to future legislative reform. Some raised concern at the 'bundling' of reforms under a single legislative vehicle generating complexity.

### **We did: -**

The Department recognises that the JRAB is a complex and wide ranging piece of legislation. Due to that technical nature, a comprehensive range of "as amended" version of Acts proposed to be amended was produced and formed part of the consultation package. Additionally, as part of the consultation materials, infographics were produced, intending to assist respondents in reviewing and understanding some technical or complex changes.

The Consultation Hub itself was set up in such a way that the Online Survey was immersive, and embedded copies of the infographics and other supporting information.

In short, while the comments of respondents have been appreciated and noted, in this instance, the JRAB (being as it amends the JRA2021, an already complex Act, and one which amends many other Acts) would never be entirely straightforward. The Department looked to provide detailed information about all key changes, and to keep extraneous information to a minimum so as to not overload consultees.

## 6. Questions on the Contempt of Court Bill 2025

As noted above, within the Executive Summary, review and summarisation of this feedback is ongoing and will be published separate to this Summary of Responses which deals with the JRAB alone.

The COCB is proposed to begin its legislation progress in early 2026, following this review and finalisation process being concluded.

## 7. Next steps

The Department has carefully considered the comments of respondents and proposes to continue to progress the JRAB changes. Where additional changes have been identified during the consultation period and have been made, these have been set out within the above Summary of Responses. Where feedback extends beyond the scope of the JRAB this has been noted for consideration in future legislative programmes.

The Department wishes to express its sincere thanks to all respondents for their valuable contributions to this consultation.

## 8. Consultation Questions

1. Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the Summary Courts set out in Section 7.2?
2. Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed corrections or enhancements to the procedure of the Juvenile Courts/Youth Courts as set out in Section 7.3?
3. Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed changes made in connection with Rules of Court, live links or electronic transactions as set out in Change / improvement number 1 and 2 of Section 7.4?
4. Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed changes in connection with the sending process (s.18 to proposed new s.18I of SJA1989) as set out in Change / improvement number 3 through to 6 of Section 7.4?

5. Do you have any comments about the proposed additional enhancements to the SJA1989 as set out in Change / improvement number 7 through to 14 of Section 7.4?
6. Do you have any comments about the proposed enhancements to the Criminal Jurisdiction Act 1993 (CJA1993), the High Court Act 1991, or Part 5 of the Justice Reform Act 2021 as set out in Change / improvement number 15 through to 19 of Section 7.4?
7. Do you have any comments about the proposed enhancements to the Criminal Law Act 1981 or Bail Act 1952 as set out in Change / improvement number 20 and 21 of Section 7.4?
8. Do you have any comments about the proposed general harmonisation or technical changes within the JRAB? Examples are set out within Change / improvement number 22 and 23?
9. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the s.19 of the Criminal Code 1892 as set out in Change number 1 of Section 7.5?
10. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Firearms Act 1947 as set out in Change number 2 of Section 7.5?
11. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Criminal Justice Act 1963 as set out in Change number 3 of Section 7.5?
12. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Jury Act 1980 as set out in Change number 4 of Section 7.5?
13. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Legal Practitioners Act 1986 as set out in Change number 6 of Section 7.5?
14. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Criminal Justice Act 1991 as set out in Change number 8 of Section 7.5?
15. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Shotguns, Air Weapons and Crossbows Act 1994 as set out in Change number 9 of Section 7.5?
16. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Custody Act 1995 as set out in Change number 10 of Section 7.5?
17. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Police Powers and Procedures Act 1998 as set out in Change number 11 of Section 7.5?
18. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Protection from Harassment Act 2000 as set out in Change number 12 of Section 7.5?
19. Do you have any comments about the proposed change to the Human Rights Act 2001 or in respect of compatibility and remedial orders as set out in Change number 13 of Section 7.5?
20. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Fireworks Act 2004 as set out in Change number 14 of Section 7.5?
21. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Criminal Justice, Police and Courts Act 2007 as set out in Change number 15 of Section 7.5?



22. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Domestic Abuse Act 2020 as set out in Change number 18 of Section 7.5?
23. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Liquor Licensing and Public Entertainments Act 2021 as set out in Change number 19 of Section 7.5?
24. Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the Sexual Offences and Obscene Publications Act 2021 as set out in Change number 20 of Section 7.5?
25. Do you have any other comments in connection with the Justice Reform (Amendment) Bill?
26. Do you have any comments about the proposed Contempt of Court Bill 2025?
27. Do you have any other comments in connection with the Contempt of Court Bill 2025.



**Isle of Man**  
**Government**

*Reiltys Ellan Vannin*



iomgovernment



iomgovernment



iomgovernment