THE TIMES

2TG Moot

The Times 2TG Moot Final 2026

News UK
12 March 2026

THE TIMES
2TG Moot

Welcome to the 11th anniversary of The Times 2TG Moot.

As a set of chambers, we have long placed an emphasis on oral advocacy, believing that there is no substitute for oral argument and debate in getting to the nub of an issue. We (as do many other chambers) reward pupillage applicants who have gained experience and shown excellence in mooting. However, we are all too aware that mooting competitions can be something of a 'closed shop' and many promising students lack the opportunities to hone their advocacy and prove their skill.

Mindful of this, in 2015/2016 The Times 2TG Moot was created to be open to all students in tertiary education, regardless of their institution or prior experience. The aim of the moot was, and remains, simple: to provide the most open and accessible mooting competition in the country, in which students from all backgrounds are enabled to participate.

As the Moot developed it became apparent that, as valuable as opportunities for University-level students are, work needed to be done to help aspiring young people envisage themselves at the Bar far earlier in their academic careers. To achieve this, for the last four years, we have worked in partnership with academy schools in inner London to provide mooting workshops to their students. As well as advocacy-based activities, the workshops include a plenary session explaining the role of a barrister and the routes to a career at the Bar. We hope to have inspired some future competitors, and future rising stars.

Whether the mooters this evening go on to apply to 2TG or to pursue a career elsewhere, we are delighted to have encouraged and supported them in this key aspect of their legal education and hope that, with the continued invaluable support and coverage from The Times, we have made some contribution to broadening access to the profession

THE TIMES 2TG Moot

17.45	Welcome drinks
19.10	Introduction & Welcome - Meghann McTague, Head of Moot Committee
19.20	Moot commences
20.10	Short Adjournment. Judges retire. Champagne & Canapés
20.40	Judgment & Prize Presentation
21.00	Closing Remarks - Bradley Martin KC, Joint Head of Chambers
21.10	Champagne & Canapés/Bowl Food
22.30	Event concludes

Judges

Lord
Neuberger

The Rt Hon Lord Neuberger of Abbotsbury

After reading chemistry at Oxford Lord Neuberger was called to the Bar in 1975 and practised largely in property law before taking silk in 1987.

He was appointed a High Court Judge, sitting in the Chancery Division, in 1996. He was made Supervisory Chancery Judge for Midland, Wales and Chester and Western Circuits from 2001. In 2004, he was appointed as Lord Justice of Appeal. In 2007 he was promoted to be a Law Lord and was appointed Master of the Rolls in 2009. Lord Neuberger became the President of the Supreme Court in 2012, a position from which he retired in 2017. Since his retirement from the Supreme Court, he has worked in arbitration and mediation from his chambers at One Essex Court.

Lord Neuberger was Treasurer of Lincoln's Inn in 2017.

Dame
Victoria Sharp

The Rt Hon Dame Victoria Sharp

Dame Victoria Sharp DBE read law at Bristol University, was called to the Bar in 1979 and took silk in 2001.

She was appointed as a Recorder in 1998, a Deputy High Court Judge in 2008 and a High Court Judge of the Queen's Bench Division in 2009.

Dame Victoria was Presiding Judge of the Western Circuit from 2012 to 2013 and was appointed a Lady Justice of Appeal in 2013.

In 2016, she was appointed Vice President of the Queen's Bench Division (now the King's Bench Division) and a member of the Judicial Executive Board and Judges' Council.

Dame Victoria was sworn in as the President of the King's Bench Division on 25 June 2019. She succeeded Sir Brian Leveson and was the first woman to hold the position.

Lady Justice Yip

The Rt Hon Lady Justice Yip DBE

Dame Amanda Yip was called to the Bar in 1991 and was in practice at the Bar based in Chambers in Liverpool until 2017.

In 2008, she became a Recorder of the Crown Court. She took silk in 2011 and was authorised to hear cases in the High Court under section 9(1) of the Senior Courts Act, 1981 in 2013. She was made a bencher of Gray's Inn in 2015.

In 2017, she was appointed as a High Court Judge and assigned to the Queen's Bench Division (now King's Bench Division). Between 2020 and 2023 she served as Presiding Judge of the Northern Circuit. During that time, she was also the Director of Civil Training at the Judicial College.

In October 2024, she was appointed Deputy Senior Presiding Judge for England and Wales. She was appointed a Lady Justice of Appeal with effect from October 2025.

Lady Justice Cockerill

The Rt Hon Lady Justice Cockerill DBE

Dame Sara Cockerill was educated at her local state primary school and then Lady Eleanor Holles School (on the Assisted Places Scheme) before reading Jurisprudence at Oxford.

In 1990 she was called to the Bar and joined Essex Court Chambers (then 4 Essex Court) in 1991. She practised as a barrister from those chambers until 2017, specialising in commercial cases.

She took silk in 2011 and was appointed as a Deputy High Court Judge in 2015, sitting in the Queen's Bench Division, specifically in the Administrative Court and the Commercial Court.

She became a High Court Judge in 2017, assigned to the Queen's Bench Division (now King's Bench Division) and as one of the Judges of the Commercial Court. Dame Sara was the Judge in Charge of the Commercial Court from August 2020 until 31 July 2022. She was appointed a Lady Justice of Appeal with effect from October 2025.

Finalists

Maddie Underhill
Bar Course Student at
BPP University

Gbenga Oniyelu
Bar Course Student at
BPP University

Marieke Audsley
Bar Course Student at the
Inns of Court College of Advocacy

Benjamin Deery
GDL Student at
The University of Law

IN THE UK SUPREME COURT **CLAIM NO. 2TGMGF26**

ON APPEAL FROM THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N:

(1) MS CHILLI HEELER
(2) MR JEAN LUC

Claimants/Appellants

- and -

(1) HAMMERBARN (in liquidation)
(2) BINGO INSURANCE CO

Defendants/Cross-Appellants

MOOT FACT PATTERN

Factual Background

1. The State of Ruritania is situated outside the European Union and is known for its beautiful landscapes, including The Creek, a large river that runs across the entire country. The majority of Ruritanian residents live in small, densely-populated towns alongside The Creek. One such town, Glasshouse, is home to 10,000 Ruritanian residents. The Creek is integral to the daily life of Ruritanian communities, including Glasshouse, and is the primary basis for Ruritanian agriculture as well as cultural events.

2. In recent years, a number of companies have set up operations in Ruritania, hoping to take advantage of the low wage level. One such company is Hammerbarn, a retailer of hardware supplies, registered in England. In 2020, Hammerbarn decided to open the first ever factory in Glasshouse to manufacture all Hammerbarn hardware products.

3. Hammerbarn has been accused of "*shady*" environmental practices vis-à-vis its factory in Ruritania, although it has never directly acknowledged or responded to these allegations.

4. On 25 November 2024, the *Ruritanian Daily* published an in-depth investigative article that alleged the Hammerbarn Factory was discharging toxic wastewater from the production line into The Creek. The article became

the most talked-about topic in Glasshouse. Residents were particularly concerned about whether Stumpfest, a popular annual event during which residents clean up debris from The Creek, should be cancelled.

5. On 4 December 2024, Hammerbarn issued the following press release, and publicised it in Ruritania:

> Hammerbarn has today reaffirmed its commitment to ensuring safe, environmentally-friendly production processes, all while maintaining the low prices Hammerbarn customers know and love. The company regularly reviews processes used in its factories to ensure compliance with the strictest global Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) standards.
>
> "*Every part of Hammerbarn's manufacturing process, every material used, is completely safe"* stated Mr Mort Cattle, Manufacturing Officer at Hammerbarn. "*We guarantee that. Hammerbarn means safety – whether that's on the production floor or at your local Hammerbarn.*"

6. After reading the press release, the Glasshouse residents decided that Stumpfest could be held. The festival commenced at dawn on 20 December 2024: Ms Chilli Heeler, a Glasshouse resident, led the charge into the river and began gleefully scooping out debris with her bare hands. An English tourist visiting Glasshouse, Mr Jean Luc, was next, diving straight into the river.

7. Almost immediately, however, Ms Chilli Heeler and Mr Jean Luc started to feel itchy. Soon, a rash started to appear on their arms and legs. It began to spread across the whole of their bodies. They were rushed to the local hospital and treated for chemical burns. Later testing linked the burns to toxic waste from the Hammerbarn Factory in The Creek.

8. On 31 July 2025, Ms Heeler and Mr Luc commenced proceedings against Hammerbarn for negligent misrepresentation, on the basis that Hammerbarn misrepresented the safety of its materials in its press release of 4 December 2024; that they had relied on this statement in participating in Stumpfest; and that this had caused their injuries.

9. Hammerbarn had taken out a public liability insurance policy with Bingo Insurance Co, an insurer domiciled in England, covering the period from 1 September 2024 to 31 August 2025. The insurance policy was subject to English law, and covered, inter alia, public liability for personal injury arising from the corporation's activities.

10. Soon after the commencement of the claim, and for unrelated reasons, Hammerbarn went into liquidation. The Claimants amended their claim to add Bingo Insurance Co as a Defendant, pursuant to the Third Parties (Rights against Insurers) Act 2010.

11. Around the same time, a recording from the Hammerbarn Annual Meeting, held in London on 1 December 2022, was leaked. The recording revealed that Hammerbarn had considered implementing waste treatment processes in the Hammerbarn Factory out of concern that the chemicals in the river were potentially dangerous to persons using the water, but shelved the idea to reduce overhead costs.

12. While Bingo Insurance Co accepted that the policy would respond to cover any liability owed by Hammerbarn to the Claimants, it denied the claim on the basis that the insurers were entitled to rescind the policy for material non-disclosure by Hammerbarn, pursuant to s 3 of the Insurance Act 2015. In particular, Bingo Insurance Co claimed that Hammerbarn ought to have known (and disclosed) that Mr Cattle, a Manufacturing Officer at Hammerbarn, had been successfully sued for personal injury arising out of the use of dangerous materials in manufacturing on two other occasions. While Mr Cattle did not play a significant role in decision-making in Hammerbarn, Bingo Insurance Co would not have entered into the insurance policy had this fact been disclosed due to the risks posed.

13. Hammerbarn, when hiring Mr Cattle for the role, had conducted a thorough background check but had not found out about the prior claims, nor had Mr Cattle informed the company about them.

14. Later, it was discovered that although information about the proceedings was publicly available, the background check failed to turn up the information on account of Mr Cattle having changed his name 10 years prior. Mr Cattle provided a witness statement stating that the claims "*had slipped his mind*", and that he did not think to alert Hammerbarn as to his former name.

The Litigation

15. While the Claimants and Defendants agreed the claim should be heard in England, they disputed what law should apply to the claim pursuant to the Rome II Regulation.

16. The Defendants argued that English law should apply: Art 4(2) Rome II would apply as between Mr Luc and the Defendants, and Art 4(3) would then operate to apply that law to the full claim, to avoid different applicable laws within the case.

17. The Claimants argued that Ruritanian law should apply: Art 4(2) operated only in relation to two-party cases, not multi-party cases, such that the rule under Art 4(1) applied. In any case, Art 4(3) would reach the same result as the injury occurred in Ruritania.

The First Instance Judgment

18. The case came before Mrs Justice Retriever. She decided to hear both the applicable law and insurance coverage issues together as preliminary issues.

19. On the first issue, she found that Ruritanian law applies: the wording of Art 4(2) Rome II, and in particular the word "*both*", excluded its application in multi-party claims.

20. On the second issue, she found that Bingo Insurance Co was entitled to rescind the insurance policy on the basis that, pursuant to s 4(6) Insurance Act 2015, Hammerbarn ought to have known of the proceedings against Mr Cattle as this "*should reasonably have been revealed by a reasonable search of information available to the insured*". This is notwithstanding the fact that she accepted that Hammerbarn conducted reasonable enquiries into Mr Cattle's background, which did not reveal the issue.

The Appeal

21. The Claimants appealed, and the Defendants cross-appealed. Given the issues on appeal involve points of general public importance, the appeal was certified to leapfrog to the Supreme Court.

22. The Claimants were granted permission to appeal on the ground that Mrs Justice Retriever was wrong to find that Bingo Insurance Co was entitled to rescind the contract, as s 4(6) Insurance Act 2015 should not extend to where reasonable enquiries would not have revealed the circumstances in question, even though they should reasonably have done so ("**Ground 1**").

23. The Defendants were granted permission to appeal on the ground that Mrs Justice Retriever was wrong to find that Art 4(2) Rome II did not apply to multi-party cases, and that English law should apply between (i) all the parties, or alternatively (ii) at least Mr Luc and the Defendants, on the basis of Arts 4(2) and 4(3) Rome II ("**Ground 2**").

24. The appeal will be heard 12 March 2025 at 7:20pm. The Supreme Court has directed parties to provide skeleton arguments, limited to 5 sides of 1.5 spaced 12pt font, by no later than 4pm on 5 March 2025. The Supreme Court has also directed that each advocate will have 12 minutes to make their submissions, including any judicial interventions.

The Times 2TG Moot Judges: Rounds 1-5

The Times 2TG Moot would not be able to operate without the many members of the judiciary and members of chambers who give up their time to judge each round.

The Committee wishes to extend its heartfelt thanks to the following individuals:

Round 1 – June 2025

Tom Fairclough
Eswar Kalidasan

Rounds 2 & 3 – July 2025

Charles Dougherty KC
Alison Green
Daniel Crowley
Clare Brown
Nina Unthank
Helen Bell
Gareth Shires
Hayley McLorinan
Andrew Bershadski
Jessica van der Meer
Emma Walker
Lucinda Spearman
Paige Mason-Thom
Harry Peto
Alex Ivory
Eswar Kalidasan
Poppy Blackshaw
Rebecca Brown

Round 4 – Quarter Final – October 2025

Andrew Collender KC
Daniel Pearce-Higgins KC
Timothy Lamb KC
Howard Palmer KC

Round 5 – Semi Final – November 2025

Rt. Hon. Lord Justice Stuart-Smith
Rt. Hon. Lord Justice Fraser

The Times 2TG Moot Committee

Deborah Francis

Meghann McTague
(Chair)

Paige Mason-Thom
(Deputy Chair)

Tom Fairclough

Alex Ivory

Eswar Kalidasan

Poppy Blackshaw

Rebecca Brown

Finn Callow

"The intellectual brilliance at 2TG is evident in the calibre of its barristers"

Legal 500 2026

CONTACT DETAILS

Address
2TG
2 Temple Gardens
London
EC4Y 9AY

Telephone
+44 (0)20 7822 1200

Email
clerks@2tg.co.uk

www.2tg.co.uk