# Jonathan Adler



**Call:** 1999
**Specialist in:**

- Family Law – Private
- Family Law – Public
- Direct Access
- Direct Access Trained

## Experience

Jonathan is a practising member of the One Pump Court Family Team, undertaking both Public Law cases and Private Law cases. He is also a member of the Immigration Team and a Bar Council accredited immigration practitioner who has previously practised in all areas of Immigration & Human Rights law.

In his Family practice, having once acted for Local Authorities in Care proceedings, he now prefers to represent parents and children. He especially enjoys representing vulnerable clients and non-British nationals.

In his private law practice he specialises in cases involving the implacable hostility of one parent towards another and its consequential impact upon children.

Jonathan is particularly interested in Attachment theory and its importance to a child's welfare and development.

Jonathan has successfully brought actions against Local Authorities in the High Court for breaches of a parent's Article 8 Human Rights.

Jonathan has experience in several cases involving parents accused of suffering from FII and, in the past two years, has been in three High Court cases involving serious injury to, or the death of, small babies, all of which involved extremely complex medical evidence.

Jonathan has had several successes when challenging toxicologists on the science of reported results of drug use in cases involving Hair Strand Testing.

In his immigration practice his particular areas of practice were refugee law, unlawful detention, human rights and deportation.

Jonathan is Direct Access qualified which means he can be booked via Chambers' clerks without a solicitor on a private basis. Click below to access Bar Council guidance on how to do this: https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/uploads/assets/20f0db2a-a40c-4af9-95b1b9557ad748e9/Public-Access-Guidance-for-Lay-Clients.pdf

## Education

Westminster School, Warwick University, College of Law, Inns of Court BVC

## Memberships

Family Law Bar Association
Association of Lawyers for Children

## Cases

### A Local Authority v X, Y, B, C & A

**[2025] EWFC 126**

The issue of the parents' anonymisation in the judgment involved an extraordinarily difficult balancing exercise between the competing Article 10 and Article 8 rights of the parties.

Read the judgment here.

### London Borough of Newham v A Mother

**[2024] EWFC 51**

Fact Find in which the mother fabricated and induced symptoms in two children, one of whom nearly died on six occasions; the father failed to protect his children.

Read the judgment here.

## Re Z (Infant Fatality)

**[2024] EWHC 618 (Fam)**

Fact Find in which a child died as the result of gross neglect by the father; the mother failed to protect the child.

Read the judgment here.

## Re WSP (A Child) (Vaccination: Religious Objection) [2023] EWHC 2622 (Fam); [2023] 10 WLUK 211; [2024] 1 F.C.R. 554

**Re WSP (A Child) (Vaccination: Religious Objection) [2023] EWHC 2622 (Fam); [2023] 10 WLUK 211; [2024] 1 F.C.R. 554**

The mother's objection to vaccinations of her child on religious grounds did not constitute a disproportionate interference with her Convention rights.

Read the judgment here.

## Re A (a child)

**[2015] EWCA Civ 910**

Where a party applied to withdraw an application for contact, as the father had when B was four years old, and the withdrawal would have an impact on the child's welfare, the court had a duty to determine whether proceedings should continue despite the parties' opinions, F (Children) (Contact Orders: Domestic Violence) [2005] EWCA Civ 499, [2005] 2 F.L.R. 950 applied. With hindsight the court could see the unfortunate consequences of the father's decision at that time, but his reasons had been based entirely on B's welfare. Normally it would be in a child's best interests to have a full relationship with each of his or her parents. All the evidence about the relationship between B and his father when there had been regular contact was entirely positive: of a warm and loving relationship. There were no adverse findings against the father. W (Children) (Direct Contact), [2012] EWCA Civ 999, [2013] 1 F.L.R. 494 explained the right approach in such cases, and Re W applied. The problem in the instant case was an adult problem; not B's. The judge had been entitled to decide that restarting contact after several years would not work. Nevertheless, the outcome was a tragedy for the father and even more so for B. Some family situations were not amenable to the blunt instrument of a judge making an order; this was such a case.

## Resources

Read the judgement.

## Re R (Care Proceedings: Appeal)

**[2013] 1 FLR 467**

In reliance on G v G (Minors: Custody Appeal) [1985] FLR 894 and Piglowska v Piglowski [1999] 2 FLR 763 the appellate court had limited powers to intervene in relation to findings of fact. There was no basis upon which the court could legitimately interfere with this judge's findings as he had clearly expressed that he had kept in mind all of the issues which required the exercise of very considerable caution. However, the court emphasised the need for judicial continuity in a case where, in serious non-compliance with the procedures of the court, there had never been an allocated judge. The fact-finding hearing, which, as made clear by the House of Lords, was merely the first part of a single process to be conducted by the same judge, meant that the final hearing should be allocated to a judge whose sitting patterns made it possible for him to conduct both parts of the hearing.

## Resources

Read the judgement.

## MA (Nigeria) v SSHD

**[2009] EWCA Civ 1229**

Case on the (then) new mandatory provisions of Immigration rule 320 which precluded re-entry to the UK after removal to a country of origin. Also the source of Ward LJ's legendary comment on Home Office decision-making: "I ask, rhetorically, is this the way to run a whelk store?"

## Resources

Read the judgement.

## AB (Jamaica) v SSHD

**[2008] HRLR 17; [2008] 1 WLR 1893; [2008] Imm AR 306 : [2008] INLR 83 : [2008] 1 WLR 1893 : Times, January 4, 2008**

In substance, albeit not in form, a British spouse is a party to proceedings. It is as much their marriage as an appellant's which is in jeopardy, and it is the impact of removal on them rather than on the foreign national which, given any lapse of years since the marriage, is critical. From Strasbourg's point of view, both sets of Convention rights were as fully engaged as the other. It cannot be permissible to give less than detailed and anxious consideration to the situation of a British citizen who has lived here all his life before it is held reasonable and proportionate to expect him to emigrate to a foreign country in order to keep his marriage intact.

## Resources

Read the judgement.

## DK (Serbia) & Others v SSHD

**[2007] 2 All ER 483**

The Court of Appeal gave guidance as to the scope of a reconsideration by the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal of its own decisions under the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 s.103A , and the procedure to be adopted.

## Resources

Read the judgement.