



David Jones

YEAR OF CALL: 1994



PRO BONO
RECOGNITION
LIST
ENGLAND & WALES



David is an extremely experienced practitioner with more than 25 years experience in a wide range of areas, including immigration and nationality law, asylum and human rights law, civil liberties and administrative and public law.

He has appeared regularly over the course of his practice at all tiers of the Courts, from the Immigration Asylum Chamber through the High Court and Court of Appeal and up to the European Court of Human Rights.

David is passionate about work in his practice areas and has a deep commitment to the protection and preservation of fundamental rights and a determination to hold to account those who breach the same.

"David's knowledge of any particular case's facts is beyond any other barrister. This, coupled with his knowledge of the law, makes him an incredible barrister and indispensable to have on your side."

"His written work is amazing. He has a very straightforward way of getting his point across."

CHAMBERS UK, 2024 (IMMIGRATION)

"A leading name in the immigration and asylum field."

CHAMBERS UK, 2023

"His bedside manner is remarkable; he puts highly stressed and worried clients at ease with his calm confidence and knowledge of the law."

CHAMBERS UK, 2022 (IMMIGRATION)

"David has expert knowledge of dealing with complex detention claims."

LEGAL 500, 2022 (IMMIGRATION)

"Excellent is an understatement. My number one person to call, his knowledge is phenomenal. He's extremely thorough and passionate and you know he's going to fight for you. Of all the barristers I've engaged he is by far the best at putting clients at ease, explaining their case to them and ensuring they fully understand everything."

CHAMBERS UK, 2020

If you would like to get in touch with David please contact the clerking team:

contactmyclerks@gclaw.co.uk | +44 (0)20 7993 7600

You can also contact David directly:

+44 (0)20 7993 7770

ADMINISTRATIVE AND PUBLIC LAW

David is an accomplished litigator in the appeal courts – from the First Tier of the Immigration and Asylum Chamber through to the Court of Appeal, in the sphere of judicial review both in the Upper Tribunal and Administrative Court, and the realm of civil litigation in relation to unlawful detention cases, regularly trying or settling high-value claims. David has been at the vanguard of proceedings seeking to attain equality of treatment for Foreign National offenders, particularly with regard to accessing to early release programs and resisting enforcement action.

NOTABLE CASES

The impact of detained fast track appeals on fresh claim disposals

R (On the application of Adda) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016] (AC-2016-LON-004209) (settled 2024)

Challenge to the Secretary of State's approach to the processing of fresh protection claims made under paragraph 353 Immigration rules where an original appeal was finally determined adversely under the Detained Fast Track regime. The Secretary of State settled the claim shortly before full hearing of the Judicial Review, withdrawing her fresh claim refusal and agreeing to weigh the potential unfairness and procedural impropriety of the original FTT disposal in line with the approach in TN(Vietnam) when remaking a decision.

Illegality of forced removals under the Iraqi Documentation exercise

QA v SSHD (D03CL294) February 2020

Highly vulnerable Iraqi asylum seeker with complex mental health issues, who was not fit to give evidence. The SSHD settled the case 5 days into the 7-day hearing following the XX of Senior Immigration and Logistics officers which confirmed that, among other things, materially changed circumstances had not been communicated to the receiving State, which together with the uncertain parameters of the removal exercise, may have prevented removal. Led to the settlement of a number of linked cases. David acted for the Claimant, instructed by Tori Sicher of Sutovic & Hartigan.

Curtailed and recovering lost leave

Hossain v SSHD (JR/5871/2017) (15 December 2020)

This was a complex judicial review, both legally and procedurally - the original claim was founded on an allegation that the Defendant had erred in claiming she had issued a curtailment letter following the revocation of the Claimant's Tier 2 Sponsors licence. David made a successful appeal leading to remittal. The Applicant's lawful residence was subsequently restored as was that of his dependents. David acted on a low win no fee basis to ensure the Applicant could afford to pursue the litigation. The Home Office required to pay the Applicant's legal costs. David led Ubah Dirie of Garden Court.

Unlawful detention following delayed provision of accommodation

R (on the application of Osadebay) v SSHD [2020] 8 WLUK 80

The Claimant was a vulnerable adult subject to immigration detention, whom the Home Office had persisted in detaining despite an order for bail from the First Tier Tribunal steps to identify a suitable address for release being progressed without due diligence. The case highlighted that judicial tolerance of Home Office and probation delays, even in the context of logistical challenges posed by Covid-19, is limited when it leads to protracted detention and prima facie human rights breach. The matter was transferred to the County Court for the issue of liability and damages for unlawful detention to be considered. The Home Office eventually settled the case making a substantial damages payment. David represented the Claimant with Taimour Lay of Garden Court, instructed by Bahar Ata of Duncan Lewis.

Continuing entitlement to a British Passports pending deprivation action

R (on the application of Gjini) v SSHD [2021] EWHC 1677 (Admin)

In an important decision, Mr Justice Morris clarified the circumstances in which it is permissible for the Home Office to decline issuing British Passports to persons subject to deprivation proceedings under section 40 of the British Nationality Act 1981, rejecting a contention by the Home Office that there was a public interest in refusing based on the fact of a past deception. The Court

further accepted argument that Home Office conduct offended EU law principles and may breach Article 8 ECHR. Instructed by Mark Lilley-Tams of OTB Solicitors. See coverage: [Electronic Immigration Network](#) (EIN).

Restoration of currency of Iraqi country guidance

QA v SSHD C4/2017/2737 on appeal from the Admin Court R (on the application of Amin) [2017] EWHC 2417 (Admin)

Acted for the Appellant. Obtained leave to appeal to appeal against the decision of the Administrative Court in which he had overrode the Country Guidance decision of the Upper Tribunal in AA(Article 15C) Iraq [2015] which found Kirkuk to be contested territory. The Home Office subsequently conceded the appeal, paying the Appellant's costs.

Country Guidance properly construed entitling Iraqi asylum seeker to a fresh claim

R (on the application of H) v The Secretary of State for the Home Department (application of AA (Iraq CG)) *IJR* [2017] UKUT 00119 (IAC)

The Upper Tribunal revisited its own decision in the country guidance case of AA (Article 15(c)) Iraq CG [2015] UKUT 00544 (IAC) in this judicial review. It obliged a thorough review of the individual circumstances of the applicant to determine whether a claim to international protection could be made by reference to other factors apart from documentation, such as ethnicity, gender, age and strength of attachments.

Nigerian National defeats Home Office decision refusing to revoke deport order and obtains damages for unlawful detention

OA, R (on the application of) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2017] EWHC 486 (Admin) (15 March 2017)

The Court concluded that the decision maker had erred when rejecting the application to revoke an outstanding deportation order. The Court also found the claimant had been unlawfully detained, highlighting when so doing a Memorandum of Understanding between the Nigeria and British Governments, the terms of which it recognised operated in this case as a substantial bar to documentation and so removal.

Albanian Domestic violence victims claim secures a right of appeal

FR & Anor (Albania), R (On the Application Of) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016]

EWCA Civ 605 (23 June 2016)

The Court of Appeal gave an important ruling as to the approach to be followed by the Home Office when certifying asylum and human rights claims as “clearly unfounded”, emphasising the need to give separate consideration to a claim for asylum, where she decides whether the claim should be refused, and the decision on certification, stressing that certification was only possible where the claim admitted of only one answer before the tribunal.

Access to settlement for Turkish workers

R (on the application of Buer) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2014] All ER (D)

20 (Aug) , [2014] EWCA Civ 1109 ILR

The claimant was a Turkish worker employed in the United Kingdom for four years before being refused indefinite leave to remain based on art6(1) of Decision No1-80 made pursuant to the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement. He was granted permission to appeal in respect of the ‘standstill clause’ at Article 13 of the decision. The Court of Appeal dismissed his appeal, as it was clear under caselaw from the Court of Justice of the EU that arts6(1) and 13 of the Decision were directed at different situations, and his rights were covered by art6(1).

Settlement obtained for a Philippine family wrongly denied status

Gonzales v the Secretary of State for the Home Department (on appeal from [2014] EWHC

1813 (Admin)

The applicants asserted an entitlement to indefinite leave to remain, contending a proper interpretation and application of the Home Office's policy statements issued under the Legacy Scheme. They were ultimately successful in the Court of Appeal following 6 years of determined litigation, the Home Office conceding their appeal at the door of the court and granting settlement.

Guidance afforded on the interpretation of long residence provisions

MD (Jamaica) & JE (Jamaica) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2010] EWCA Civ 213

The Court of Appeal adopted a strict approach to construction, finding that grants of leave to remain, pursuant to an application made after the expiry of a previous grant of leave to remain, did not operate to legalise the applicant's residence during the period between the expiry and the subsequent grant of leave to remain. It was held that the lawfulness of residence at any given time had to be judged by reference to law in force at the time.

Other notable reported cases

Error of law for the Tribunal to go behind pre-existing favourable findings of fact

MY (Turkey) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2008] EWCA Civ 477; [2008] All ER (D) 101 (public law)

Conviction for illegal entry quashed for failure to consider refugee defence

R on the application of Badur v (1) Birmingham Crown Court (2) Solihull Magistrates' Court & (1) Director of Public Prosecutions (2) Secretary of State for the Home Department (3) Crown Prosecution Service (Interested Parties) [2006] EWHC 539 (Admin)

Seamen deserters entitled to same fair treatment

R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Urmaza [1996] Times LR (11th July 1996) (QBD)

ASYLUM AND HUMAN RIGHTS LAW

In November 2022, David appeared at the Joint Committee on Human Rights in Parliament as a witness to submit evidence in the first session of its new inquiry into the human rights of asylum seekers. It examined the legal framework governing the length of detention and the conditions in which asylum seekers are held. [Watch the session here.](#)

David's commitment extends beyond his work in the Courts and Tribunals as an advocate. He is a Director and Co-Founder of two companies which deliver training on and conduct research into human rights and public

law and practice domestically and internationally.

NOTABLE CASES

The impact of detained fast track appeals on fresh claim disposals

R (On the application of Adda) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016] (AC-2016-LON-004209) (settled 2024)

Challenge to the Secretary of State's approach to the processing of fresh protection claims made under paragraph 353 Immigration rules where an original appeal was finally determined adversely under the Detained Fast Track regime. The Secretary of State settled the claim shortly before full hearing of the Judicial Review, withdrawing her fresh claim refusal and agreeing to weigh the potential unfairness and procedural impropriety of the original FTT disposal in line with the approach in *TN(Vietnam)* when remaking a decision.

No requirement for corroboration in asylum and human rights appeals

MAH (Egypt) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2023] EWCA Civ 216

The case concerned an asylum seeker who had entered the UK as a child. The appellant was fleeing persecution owing to allegations by the authorities in Egypt that he and his father were supporters of the Muslim Brotherhood. The appeal was allowed and the Appellant was found by the Court to be entitled to refugee status when the available evidence was evaluated lawfully. The Home Office was also required to pay all of the Appellant's reasonable costs.

The extension of protection to Albanian victims of trafficking

SSHD v PG (Albania) (CA/2022/2017)

The appeal concerned a challenge by the Secretary of State to the Court of Appeal from the allowed appeal of the Upper Tribunal where in which Ms Solanki had established PG was at risk of future harm by reason of her previous subjection to trafficking. The Home Office withdrew the appeal shortly before the full hearing and granted PG leave to remain. PG recovered her costs of the appeal. David led Priya Solanki of 1 Pump Court.

Illegality of forced removals under the Iraqi Documentation exercise

QA v SSHD (D03CL294) February 2020

Highly vulnerable Iraqi asylum seeker with complex mental health issues, who was not fit to give evidence. The SSHD settled the case 5 days into the 7-day hearing following the XX of Senior Immigration and Logistics officers which confirmed that, among other things, materially changed circumstances had not been communicated to the receiving State, which together with the uncertain parameters of the removal exercise, may have prevented removal. Led to the settlement of a number of linked cases. David acted for the Claimant, instructed by Tori Sicher of Sutovic & Hartigan.

Unlawful detention following delayed provision of accommodation

R (on the application of Osadebay) v SSHD [2020] 8 WLUK 80

The Claimant was a vulnerable adult subject to immigration detention, whom the Home Office had persisted in detaining despite an order for bail from the First Tier Tribunal steps to identify a suitable address for release being progressed without due diligence. The case highlighted that judicial tolerance of Home Office and probation delays, even in the context of logistical challenges posed by Covid-19, is limited when it leads to protracted detention and prima facie human rights breach. The matter was transferred to the County Court for the issue of liability and damages for unlawful detention to be considered. The Home Office eventually settled the case making a substantial damages payment. David represented the Claimant with Taimour Lay of Garden Court, instructed by Bahar Ata of Duncan Lewis.

Unravelling the Iraqi documentation exercise - CSID's, INID's and Removals to Iraq

MA and RO (Iraq) v SSHD [2021] EWCA Civ 1467

The case of *RO* was called in by the Court of Appeal and linked with *MA* with the object of providing guidance on the meaning of various country guidance ('CG') determinations of the Upper Tribunal (IAC), and how Iraqi nationals may obtain identity documents, possession of

which is necessary to avoid a breach of article 3 if returned to Iraq. The appeal was allowed, the case resolving on a critique of the treatment of the individual appeals by the Upper Tribunal. It offered important guidance on how the Upper Tribunal should perform its review function. The Home Office was required to pay the Appellant's costs. David led Alistair Henderson of 1 Crown Office Row, instructed by Tori Sicher of Sutovic Hartigan.

Victory in false imprisonment action challenging the lawfulness of Home Office Iraqi removal exercise

QA v SSHD (D03CL294)

David acted for the Applicant, QA, instructed by Tori Sicher of Sutovic & Hartigan, whose claim for damages for unlawful detention concluded mid-trial with an offer of settlement. The case challenged the lawfulness of the enforcement exercise initiated by the Home Office in 2017. The Claimant recovered a substantial sum in damages and the Home Office was required to pay all of the costs of the proceedings.

European Court of Human Rights finds torture victims detention unlawful

S.M.M. v. The United Kingdom (Application no. 77450/12)

The ECtHR found the U.K. had violated Article 5 § 1, concluding more decisive steps should have been taken to bring the decision making process swiftly to a close given his acknowledged vulnerability of the Zimbabwean national.

Restoration of currency of Iraqi country guidance

QA v SSHD C4/2017/2737 on appeal from the Admin Court R (on the application of Amin) [2017]

EWHC 2417 (Admin)

Acted for the Appellant. Obtained leave to appeal to appeal against the decision of the Administrative Court in which he had overrode the Country Guidance decision of the Upper Tribunal in *AA*(Article 15C) Iraq [2015] which found Kirkuk to be contested territory. The Home Office subsequently conceded the appeal, paying the Appellant's costs.

Country Guidance properly construed entitling Iraqi asylum seeker to a fresh claim

R (on the application of H) v The Secretary of State for the Home Department (application of AA (Iraq CG))
IJR [2017] UKUT 00119 (IAC)

The Upper Tribunal revisited its own decision in the country guidance case of *AA (Article 15(c)) Iraq CG* [2015] UKUT 00544 (IAC) in this judicial review. It obliged a thorough review of the individual circumstances of the applicant to determine whether a claim to international protection could be made by reference to other factors apart from documentation, such as ethnicity, gender, age and strength of attachments.

Albanian Domestic violence victims claim secures a right of appeal

FR & Anor (Albania), R (On the Application Of) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016]
EWCA Civ 605 (23 June 2016)

The Court of Appeal gave an important ruling as to the approach to be followed by the Home Office when certifying asylum and human rights claims as “clearly unfounded”, emphasising the need to give separate consideration to a claim for asylum, where she decides whether the claim should be refused, and the decision on certification, stressing that certification was only possible where the claim admitted of only one answer before the tribunal.

Protection claims for homosexual men held to enjoy substance

R on the application of SE v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016] UKUT JR-13730-2015

This judicial review concerned the denial of access to an in-country right of appeal to an Albanian homosexual, with the threshold of harm necessary to establish persecution and the necessity exhaust domestic avenues of protection also being contentious issues. The Upper Tribunal ruled authoritatively in favour of the Applicant that there was facility even on the latest country information for the establishment of a protection need by homosexuals.

Protection need established for trafficking victims

AM and BM (Trafficked women) Albania CG [2010] UKUT 80 (IAC)

The case addressed Country Guidance issues such as whether trafficked women are capable of constituting a particular social group of the Refugee Convention, to what extent decision makers must take into account risks of re-trafficking, stigmatisation & discrimination, sufficiency of protection in respect of threats from traffickers, safety & reasonableness of internal relocation alternative. Case-specific issues were whether the proposed removal of the Appellants from the UK was compatible with the UK's obligations under Articles 3 and 8 of the ECHR.

Other notable reported cases

Error of law for the Tribunal to go behind pre-existing favourable findings of fact

MY (Turkey) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2008] EWCA Civ 477; [2008] All ER (D) 101 (public law)

Conviction for illegal entry quashed for failure to consider refugee defence

R on the application of Badur v (1) Birmingham Crown Court (2) Solihull Magistrates' Court & (1) Director of Public Prosecutions (2) Secretary of State for the Home Department (3) Crown Prosecution Service (Interested Parties) [2006] EWHC 539 (Admin)

Established as substantial protection claims founded on threat from organised criminals in Jamaica

Atkinson v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2004] EWCA Civ 846 (CA), Times LR (20 July 2004)

Harmonised the approach to the fact-finding in cases involving the Refugee and European Convention on Human Rights in the UK

Kacaj v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2001] INLR 354 (IAT); [2002] EWCA Civ 314

Sikh nationalists Protection claim renewed

Tarlochan Singh v Secretary for the Home Department [1999] Imm AR 1 (CA), *Wilby v*

Secretary of State for the Home Department [1999] Immigration Law Update (HMSO)

The proper approach to the assessment of fresh claims for asylum

R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Hamid Habibi [1997] Imm AR 391
(QBD)

EU LAW

Notable Cases

Substantive unfairness in the disposal of an EU deportation appeal

A v Secretary of State for Home Department [2020] EWCA Civ 858 [2020] 7 WLUK 104 Concerned the lawfulness of a deportation order made in respect of an individual married to an EEA national where the Home Office alleged the Appellant was the head of an organised crime family. The case raised important issues on procedural fairness and evidence in statutory appeals before the Upper Tribunal of the Immigration Asylum Chamber when re-making of a decision on new evidence. David represented the Appellant with Tim Baldwin of Garden Court, instructed by Rachel Meates of Irving & Co. See press coverage: [The Telegraph](#).

False imprisonment and personal injury claim made by Zimbabwean national lawfully present in the U.K

Tapiwa Matukutire settled at pre-action stage

False imprisonment and personal injury claim made by Zimbabwean national lawfully present in the UK. Claimant falsely accused of being present irregularly and subject to humiliating attempts to detain and restrain by over six immigration officers in his own home, owing to a failure to properly check his status before pursuing enforcement action. The case revealed the human cost of the information sharing created by the “hostile environment” policy. The Claimant recovered damages for loss of liberty and personal injury, and recovered the costs of preparation of the civil claim. Press coverage: [ITV News](#) and [Sky News](#).

Access to settlement for Turkish workers

R (on the application of Buer) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2014] All ER (D) 20 (Aug) , [2014] EWCA Civ 1109 ILR

The claimant was a Turkish worker employed in the United Kingdom for four years before being refused indefinite leave to remain based on art6(1) of Decision No1-80 made pursuant to the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement. He was granted permission to appeal in respect of the ‘standstill clause’ at Article 13 of the

decision. The Court of Appeal dismissed his appeal, as it was clear under caselaw from the Court of Justice of the EU that arts6(1) and 13 of the Decision were directed at different situations, and his rights were covered by art6(1).

IMMIGRATION DETENTION CIVIL CLAIMS

Market commentators highlight David's strong track record of securing substantial damages for individuals who have been unlawfully detained. He has also represented business migrants and high net-worth individuals. David has appeared before the Parliamentary Joint Committee for Human Rights to address concerns with UK detention practices and lectured with eminent Judges and academics at the Refugee Law Initiative, OU Refugee Week and the UK Chapter of ERA.

David is a member of Bail for Immigration Detainees (BID's) pro bono bail panel.

NOTABLE CASES

Illegality of forced removals under the Iraqi Documentation exercise

QA v SSHD (D03CL294) February 2020

Highly vulnerable Iraqi asylum seeker with complex mental health issues, who was not fit to give evidence. The SSHD settled the case 5 days into the 7-day hearing following the XX of Senior Immigration and Logistics officers which confirmed that, among other things, materially changed circumstances had not been communicated to the receiving State, which together with the uncertain parameters of the removal exercise, may have prevented removal. Led to the settlement of a number of linked cases. David acted for the Claimant, instructed by Tori Sicher of Sutovic & Hartigan.

Unlawful detention following delayed provision of accommodation

R (on the application of Osadebay) v SSHD [2020] 8 WLUK 80

The Claimant was a vulnerable adult subject to immigration detention, whom the Home Office had persisted in detaining despite an order for bail from the First Tier Tribunal steps to identify a suitable address for release being progressed without due diligence.

The case highlighted that judicial tolerance of Home Office and probation delays, even in the context of logistical challenges posed by Covid-19, is limited when it leads to protracted detention and prima facie human rights breach. The matter was transferred to the County Court for the issue of liability and damages for unlawful detention to be considered. The Home Office eventually settled the case making a substantial damages payment. David represented the Claimant with Taimour Lay of Garden Court, instructed by Bahar Ata of Duncan Lewis.

Victory in false imprisonment action challenging the lawfulness of Home Office Iraqi removal exercise

QA v SSHD (D03CL294)

David acted for the Applicant, QA, instructed by Tori Sicher of Sutovic & Hartigan, whose claim for damages for unlawful detention concluded mid-trial with an offer of settlement. The case challenged the lawfulness of the enforcement exercise initiated by the Home Office in 2017. The Claimant recovered a substantial sum in damages and the Home Office was required to pay all of the costs of the proceedings.

False imprisonment and personal injury claim made by Zimbabwean national lawfully present in the U.K

Tapiwa Matukutire settled at pre-action stage

False imprisonment and personal injury claim made by Zimbabwean national lawfully present in the UK. Claimant falsely accused of being present irregularly and subject to humiliating attempts to detain and restrain by over six immigration officers in his own home, owing to a failure to properly check his status before pursuing enforcement action. The case revealed the human cost of the information sharing created by the “hostile environment” policy. The Claimant recovered damages for loss of liberty and personal injury, and recovered the costs of preparation of the civil claim. Press coverage: [ITV News](#) and [Sky](#)

[News.](#)

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY LAW

Over more than two decades, David has developed an extraordinary level of expertise as a practitioner barrister in all areas of immigration, human rights, EU Free Movement, and nationality law. David also enjoys an expanding practice in managed and business migration.

NOTABLE CASES

Maxwell Investor cases (2020-Current)

David was initially instructed to advise on the legality of an investor scheme implemented under the Tier 1 Investor scheme, affecting 106 overseas investors all of whom disclosed assets of in excess of £2 million and investment of £1 million. David has engaged in a diverse range of activities from speaking and advising at investor forums, to providing updates to the legal officer of the foreign embassies and press briefings. David continues to work to secure access to alternative forms of leave for victims of the scheme and has secured alternative forms of status for a number of investors and their families.

Strategic advice on complex investment scheme

DIS v Home Office (2021)

David was instructed to advise on the legality of a multi-million pound investment scheme which concerned multiple participants seeking entry through the high net work investor category in the rules (now withdrawn). David provided strategic litigation guidance, advised on evidence gathering and case preparation.

Substantive unfairness in the disposal of an EU deportation appeal

A v Secretary of State for Home Department [2020] EWCA Civ 858 [2020] 7 WLUK 104

Concerned the lawfulness of a deportation order made in respect of an individual married to an EEA national where the Home Office alleged the Appellant was the head of an organised crime family. The case raised important issues on procedural fairness and evidence in

statutory appeals before the Upper Tribunal of the Immigration Asylum Chamber when re-making of a decision on new evidence. David represented the Appellant with Tim Baldwin of Garden Court, instructed by Rachel Meates of Irving & Co. See press coverage: [The Telegraph](#).

Curtailment and recovering lost leave

Hossain v SSHD (JR/5871/2017) (15 December 2020)

This was a complex judicial review, both legally and procedurally - the original claim was founded on an allegation that the Defendant had erred in claiming she had issued a curtailment letter following the revocation of the Claimant's Tier 2 Sponsors licence. David made a successful appeal leading to remittal. The Applicant's lawful residence was subsequently restored as was that of his dependents. David acted on a low win no fee basis to ensure the Applicant could afford to pursue the litigation. The Home Office required to pay the Applicant's legal costs. David led Ubah Dirie of Garden Court.

Jamaica, deportation and risks on return

RM (Jamaica) v SSHD (PA/04482/2019(P)) 07 September 2021

This appeal was considered by both the First Tier and the Upper Tribunal of the Immigration and Asylum Chamber and was concerned with the lawfulness of deportation action initiated against the Appellant. The appeal was remitted by the Upper Tribunal in 2020, David successfully having set aside an adverse decision of the First Tier, and in 2021 the appeal was allowed by a different Judge of the First Tier. The Appellant now has leave to remain in the UK. Press Coverage: [Bristol Post](#), [Buzzfeed News](#).

Withdrawal of deportation order following appeal to the ECtHR

M.M. v. UK (Application no. 32953-20)(2021)

A deportation case where access to all substantive domestic appeal rights had been exhausted at the point David was instructed, and M.M was facing enforced separation from his wife and children. David,

acting on a no win no fee basis, issued an application to the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) which raised various arguments, including that the UK deportation regime was unlawful failing to protect the Applicant and his families' article 8 interests. In settlement, David secured withdrawal of the deportation order, the extension of 30 months leave to remain and the return of the Applicant's costs of issuing the claim in the ECtHR.

Continuing entitlement to a British Passports pending deprivation action

R (on the application of Gjini) v SSHD [2021] EWHC 1677 (Admin)

In an important decision, Mr Justice Morris clarified the circumstances in which it is permissible for the Home Office to decline issuing British Passports to persons subject to deprivation proceedings under section 40 of the British Nationality Act 1981, rejecting a contention by the Home Office that there was a public interest in refusing based on the fact of a past deception. The Court further accepted argument that Home Office conduct offended EU law principles and may breach Article 8 ECHR. Instructed by Mark Lilley-Tams of OTB Solicitors. See coverage: [Electronic Immigration Network](#) (EIN).

False imprisonment and personal injury claim made by Zimbabwean national lawfully present in the U.K

Tapiwa Matukutire settled at pre-action stage

False imprisonment and personal injury claim made by Zimbabwean national lawfully present in the UK. Claimant falsely accused of being present irregularly and subject to humiliating attempts to detain and restrain by over six immigration officers in his own home, owing to a failure to properly check his status before pursuing enforcement action. The case revealed the human cost of the information sharing created by the "hostile environment" policy. The Claimant recovered damages for loss of liberty and personal injury, and recovered the costs of preparation of the civil claim. Press coverage: [ITV News](#) and [Sky News](#).

Nigerian National defeats Home Office decision refusing to revoke deport order and obtains damages for unlawful detention

OA, R (on the application of) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2017] EWHC 486 (Admin) (15 March 2017)

The Court concluded that the decision maker had erred when rejecting the application to revoke an outstanding deportation order. The Court also found the claimant had been unlawfully detained, highlighting when so doing a Memorandum of Understanding between the Nigeria and British Governments, the terms of which it recognised operated in this case as a substantial bar to documentation and so removal.

Access to settlement for Turkish workers

R (on the application of Buer) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2014] All ER (D) 20 (Aug) , [2014] EWCA Civ 1109 ILR

The claimant was a Turkish worker employed in the United Kingdom for four years before being refused indefinite leave to remain based on art6(1) of Decision No1-80 made pursuant to the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement. He was granted permission to appeal in respect of the 'standstill clause' at Article 13 of the decision. The Court of Appeal dismissed his appeal, as it was clear under caselaw from the Court of Justice of the EU that arts6(1) and 13 of the Decision were directed at different situations, and his rights were covered by art6(1).

Settlement obtained for a Philippine family wrongly denied status

Gonzales v the Secretary of State for the Home Department (on appeal from [2014] EWHC 1813 (Admin))

The applicants asserted an entitlement to indefinite leave to remain, contending a proper interpretation and application of the Home Office's policy statements issued under the Legacy Scheme. They were ultimately successful in the Court of Appeal following 6 years of determined litigation, the Home Office conceding their appeal at the door of the court and granting settlement.

Guidance afforded on the interpretation of long residence provisions

MD (Jamaica) & JE (Jamaica) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2010] EWCA Civ 213

The Court of Appeal adopted a strict approach to construction, finding that grants of leave to remain, pursuant to an application made after the expiry of a previous grant of leave to remain, did not operate to legalise the applicant's residence during the period between the expiry and the subsequent grant of leave to remain. It was held that the lawfulness of residence at any given time had to be judged by reference to law in force at the time.

Other notable reported cases

Seamen deserters entitled to same fair treatment

R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Urmaza [1996] Times LR (11th July 1996) (QBD)

Conviction for illegal entry quashed for failure to consider refugee defence

R on the application of Badur v (1) Birmingham Crown Court (2) Solihull Magistrates' Court & (1) Director of Public Prosecutions (2) Secretary of State for the Home Department (3) Crown Prosecution Service (Interested Parties) [2006] EWHC 539 (Admin)

Error of law for the Tribunal to go behind pre-existing favourable findings of fact

MY (Turkey) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2008] EWCA Civ 477; [2008] All ER (D) 101 (public law)

WHAT OTHERS SAY

"Kind and compassionate, and most importantly knowledgeable, working tirelessly to ensure we got the outcome we hoped for. David Jones took our case on willingly, clearly determined to help us. ☐ Public Access Client, June 2021

"David handled the case brilliantly from the start until the first tribunal hearing. Since then, David and his team have helped me prepare and file for all my applications and have always achieved a positive decision well before time. Due to the excellent results, I have recommended my friends and family to always use

David`s services. I would 100% always recommend David Jones for any immigration-related matters." - Public Access Client, June 2021

"It is my privilege to recommend David as an excellent Barrister. He is truly the best and most brilliant Barrister I have ever had. I believe his work would, not only meet, but exceed your expectations. He worked tirelessly hard to ensure the best possible outcome. He is a solid and extraordinary Barrister." - Tanvin Ara, Public Access Client, March 2021

"David's vast knowledge of immigration law makes him the first choice in complex cases, but his compassion and understanding of the human cost to his client of not winning their case gives him the drive needed to take on the Home Office against the odds." - Amanda Penfold, Public Access Client, May 2020

David believes in people, because he understands them... you know that David will never let you down and will make the court feel the same way about you, as he does." - Alexander Shapovalov, Public Access Client, April 2020

"I can't speak highly enough of David. His dedication and attention to detail in a complex case involving medical elements... led to a swift conclusion in our favour. Our case was put forward in an impeccable manner, leaving no space for our counterpart to have any chance of success. We were mostly mesmerized with his final submissions and speech, thank you David." - Monique Gonggrijp-Bello, Public Access Client, November 2019

"His closing speech was a tour de force, it would be all too easy to come across as preachy or pompous but he delivered this eloquently and with great passion and emotion." - Justin Davies, Public Access Client

"David is excellent at communicating with clients and building a rapport. He is able to advise business clients as he understands the commercial context and what the drivers are for these clients." - Legal 500, 2021 (Immigration)

"David is an enormously experienced barrister who fights every case with great passion and skill." - Chambers UK, 2021 (Immigration)

"Excellent is an understatement. My number one person to call, his knowledge is phenomenal. He's extremely thorough and passionate and you know he's going to fight for you. Of all the barristers I've engaged he is by far the best at putting clients at ease, explaining their case to them and ensuring they fully understand everything." - Chambers UK, 2020

"He has wonderful interpersonal skills and his engagement with clients and the court is exemplary." - Legal 500, 2020

"He produces very good results and is very committed to clients. He is very experienced and tactical." - Chambers UK, 2019

BACKGROUND

David began his practice as locum caseworker for the [Immigration Advisory Service](#). At the same time, he also volunteered as an outdoor clerk for the [Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants](#), and worked as an Administrative assistant at the [Immigration Law Practitioners' Association \(ILPA\)](#).

For several years following the commencement of practice David also assumed the role of a Trustee at the Charity [Electronic Immigration Network](#).

In 2000, David co-founded [HJT Research](#) with the objective of developing a comprehensive database of human rights reports to aid practitioners and litigants concerned with establishing an entitlement to protection by reason of conditions on their countries of origin. The resource is now in its 20th year, is published by the [Electronic Immigration Network](#) and provides a comprehensive record of human rights conditions in over 120 countries worldwide.

Perceiving a need in the sector, David established with long term friend and Colleague Mark Symes, a specialist immigration and human rights training company HJT Training in 2003. Over time HJT has delivered training on all areas of immigration and human rights law to a diverse array of delegates from all areas of practice, as well as NGO's, Governmental departments (both foreign and domestic), International agencies and commercial entities.

Outside of his professional life, he has assumed the role of a school Governor and Chair of Governors to Westminster Diocesan School between 2009 and 2014. He has also served on working groups concerned with the establishment of Academies within the faith school system at both County and Diocesan level.

He is currently a member of the [Haldane Society of Socialist Lawyers](#) and [ILPA](#).

PUBLICATIONS

David is a long-time contributor to *Macdonald's Immigration Law and Practice* 5th-9th Editions (Butterworths Lexis Nexis). He is currently writing the 'Refugee Law' chapter for the 11th Edition.

David is also a contributor and editor of *Mastering Immigration Law*, an online resource of immigration and human rights law.

He also contributed to HJT's *Immigration Manual* from its inception through to its current 20th Edition.

He has, in the past, prepared immigration chapters for both *Your Rights* (Liberty); and *Atkins Court Forms Immigration Volume* (Butterworths).

More recently David prepared the Trafficking chapter in the Immigration and Asylum Handbook published by the Law Society.

TRAINING AND SEMINARS

David is a Visiting Fellow for the Open University and has developed [\(with the OU and HJT training\)](#) an 'Introduction to Immigration' course which launched in 2022, and has prepared an 'Advanced Immigration' course due to launch.

Over the past two years David has prepared and presented training courses on the following:

- Basic principles of Judicial Review**
- Unlawful Detention: law and procedures**
- Free movement and the European Union**
- Nationality Law**
- Tier 1 and 2 points based system**
- Employers sanctions and illegal working**
- Article 8 within and outwith the rules**
- Rule 39 applications to the European Court of Human Rights**
- Policies and concessions of the UK Border Agency (UKBA)**
- Deportation**
- Advocacy**

APPEARANCES

HJT Webinar 'Certification, inadmissibility and the Rwanda scheme' - 25 January 2024

Refugee Law Initiative Seminar 'Defining refugees under the new legislative frameworks' - 16 November 2023

June 2023

EDUCATION

Bar Vocational Course - Inns of Court School of Law (1995-1996)

LLM International Economic and Corporate Law - Queen Mary College, University of London (1994-1995)

LLB Hons (2:1) - Queen Mary College, University of London (1991-1994)

Foundation Degree in English and American Literature - University of Kent (1990-1991)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Immigration Law Practitioners' Association

Haldane Society

Amnesty International

If you would like to get in touch with David please contact the clerking team:

contactmyclerks@gclaw.co.uk | +44 (0)20 7993 7600

You can also contact David directly:

+44 (0)20 7993 7770



57-60 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, WC2A 3LJ

Email: info@gclaw.co.uk

Tel: +44 (0)20 7993 7600

DX: 34 Chancery Lane