

## Olivia Beach

Call: 2022

**LinkedIn:**

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/olivia-beach-241016/>



**Specialist in:**

- Criminal Law
- Housing & Community Care
- Prison Law
- Inquests & Public Inquiries Team
- Civil Actions Against Public Authorities
- Modern Slavery & Trafficking Team
- Specialist Family & Immigration Team

## Experience

Olivia practises in all areas of public and human rights law, including migrants rights, trafficking, homelessness, & prison, as well as crime and civil actions.

She is ranked as a Legal 500 2026 Rising Star in Court of Protection: health and welfare for her community care and social welfare practice, described as a “*conscientious and diligent junior*”. She has been praised by instructing solicitors for showing “*a faultless ability to prepare work of the highest standard, regardless of the legal challenge, to ensure that an individual’s needs are met and any Defendant Public Body is held accountable for their actions*”.

### Public Law and Human Rights

Olivia is regularly instructed in judicial review matters across a broad range of public law and human rights areas, including migrants rights, community care and social welfare, modern slavery and trafficking, homelessness, prison and parole board matters, and criminal law related public law. She is also regularly instructed in Section 204 homelessness appeals in the County Court. Olivia also undertakes civil claims against public authorities, often arising

out of judicial review matters.

Olivia has appeared both led and unled in the High Court and has worked across all stages of judicial review proceedings. Olivia has experience in advising on procedural issues, in particular on the issue of costs and drafting written submissions on costs.

Some recent examples of notable cases Olivia has been instructed in are:

*R (ABAJ) v West Sussex County Council [2025] EWHC 1564 (Admin)* – A successful judicial review challenging an age assessment and provisions under the Children Act 1989.

*R (Newton) v Parole Board of England and Wales [2025] EWHC 631 (Admin)* – A successful judicial review challenging the Parole Board's refusal of an oral hearing, and finding a breach of Article 5(4) ECHR.

*R (RU) v London Borough of Redbridge and North East London NHA Foundation Trust (AC-2024-LON-2575)* – A judicial review concerning the Defendant's failures under Section 117 Mental Health Act 1983. The Local Authority conceded various breaches of Section 117 Mental Health Act 1983, the Care and Support Statutory Guidance, Mental Health Act 1983 Code of Practice, and Article 3 and Article 8 ECHR, the day before the substantive hearing.

*R (McKilligan) v Parole Board of England and Wales [2024] EWHC 336 (Admin)* – A successful judicial review challenging the Parole Board's refusal of an oral hearing.

*R (McPhee) v Secretary of State for Justice [2024] EWHC 1247 (Admin)* – A successful challenge to the Secretary of State's decision not to move the Claimant to open conditions.

*R (NS) Secretary of State for the Home Department [2023] EWHC 2675 (Admin)* – Led by Chris Buttler KC, this case was a successful judicial review concerning the provision of accommodation to an asylum seeker under Section 98 Immigration and Asylum Act 1999. The judgment records important findings about evidence, or lack of, provided by the SSHD in these sorts of cases.

## **Crime**

Olivia represents clients in the Youth, Magistrates and Crown Courts. She has a particular interest in youth justice, criminal justice system related public law issues, international crime, and working with vulnerable Defendant's to try and secure outcomes that facilitate recovery and rehabilitation.



## **Public Inquiries**

Olivia has been instructed in the Andrew Malkinson Inquiry, chaired by Her Honour Judge Sarah Munro KC.

## **Pro Bono Work**

Olivia is a Duty Scheme Advocate for Asylum Support Appeals Project (ASAP), regularly acting pro bono for asylum seekers at the First Tier Tribunal (Asylum Support). She undertakes additional pro bono work for other organisations including Bail for Immigration Detainees and West London Welcome. She is also on the Executive Committee at the Human Rights Lawyers Association.

## **Prior to the Bar**

Prior to coming to the Bar, Olivia worked as a community care and public law paralegal, working on over 40 judicial reviews for claimants largely concerned with the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 and the Care Act 2014. Olivia also works on her own voluntary organisation, PLOD Foundation, which provides assistance to the homeless, refugees, asylum seekers and bereaved children. She has previously volunteered with organisations including The Intervene Project and AMICUS ALJ.

## **What the directories say**

“A conscientious and diligent junior”

Legal 500 2026: Rising Star in Court of Protection: health and welfare

## **Education**

Master of Laws (LLM), University of Law

Bar Practice Course, University of Law

Graduate Diploma in Law, BPP University

Bsc (Hons) Politics with Economics, University of Bath

## **Memberships**

Administrative Bar Association

Human Rights Lawyers Association



Young Legal Aid Lawyers  
Bar Human Rights Committee  
AMICUS ALJ

## Awards

Ann Goddard Pupillage Scholarship – Gray’s Inn

Marion Simmons Scholarship (BPC) – Gray’s Inn

Nina Lowry Scholarship (GDL) – Gray’s Inn

Career Changers Scholarship – University of Law

## Cases

### **Indemnity costs ordered against Local authority who conceded breaches of Mental Health Act, Care Act Statutory Guidance, Code of Practice and Articles 3 and 8 ECHR**

Olivia Beach represented a very vulnerable individual in a long-running judicial review concerning the provision of aftercare under Section 117 Mental Health Act.

Just the day before the substantive hearing, the London Borough of Redbridge conceded breaches of Section 117 Mental Health Act, Section 40 Care Act 2014, the Care Act Statutory Guidance, the Mental Health Code of Practice, and breaches of the Claimant’s Article 3 and Article 8 ECHR rights.

Whilst a substantive hearing did not take place as a result of these concessions being made in a consent order, directions were set for cost submissions. In an order dated 11 May 2026, Benjamin Douglas-Jones KC sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge ordered the London Borough of Redbridge to pay the Claimant’s costs on an indemnity basis.

In making this Order, the following reasoning was given:

*“...the Defendant was presented with numerous opportunities (i) to articulate a proper defence; (ii) to submit evidence in support of any stance it took in the Claim; (iii) to engage properly and actively in the proceedings; and (iv) to resolve the dispute at a much earlier stage. The Defendant took none of these steps. The Defendant has offered no justification for*

*these failures and has even failed to file and serve, in breach of a consent order to which it was a party, submissions explaining why I should refuse to order that the Claimant's costs be assessed on the indemnity basis by the 31 July 2025 deadline or at all."*

Olivia was instructed by Monica Kreel at TV Edwards.

Case number AC-2024-LON-002575

## **R (ABAJ) v West Sussex County Council [2025]**

### **EWHC 1564 (Admin)**

Olivia acted for the Claimant, and the Local Authority's decision to treat him as an adult so that he was not entitled to support under the Children Act 1989, and carrying out a brief enquiry without meeting the client, was irrational.

It was found that the Defendant had not undertaken their own assessment of the Claimant but had instead relied on the assessment carried out by the Home Office, without considering the substance of the Home Office's determination, including that no interpreter or appropriate adult had been present at the assessment.

Olivia was instructed by Abigail Briggs and Scott Laing at Bhatia Best Solicitors.

## **R (BX) v London Borough of Brent (AC-2024-LON-004246)**

Olivia Beach represented a vulnerable, young woman ("BX") who is a victim of trafficking and a care leaver in a judicial review challenging the decision of the London Borough of Brent to move BX out of her accommodation and into alternative premises without her consultation and without carrying out a lawful Care Act assessment, in breach of the Care Act 2014 and the Equality Act 2010.

After issuing the claim, the London Borough of Brent subsequently agreed that BX could remain in her accommodation and to carry out a fresh care needs assessment in accordance with the Care Act 2014.

Olivia was instructed by Jonathan Farrell at Kesar & Co Solicitors.

## **R (Christopher Newton) v Parole Board of England and Wales**

### **[2025] EWHC 631 (Admin)**

Olivia Beach succeeds in judicial review of Parole Board decision. The challenge succeeded on the basis of procedural fairness, with the Judge finding the decision to refuse Mr Newton an oral hearing procedurally unfair for a number of reasons. Read the reported judgment [here](#).

Olivia was instructed by Emma Gauden, of Howards Solicitors.

## **R (Davidson) v Cambridge City Council**

**[2023] EWHC 1022 (KB)**

Olivia succeeded in securing interim relief and permission to apply for judicial review in this case concerning a vulnerable homeless client with complex mental and physical health needs.

It was successfully argued that the interim accommodation he had been provided was unsuitable and that the Defendant was under an on-going duty to review suitability.

HHJ Walden-Smith found that even though interim accommodation is subject to a lower suitability standard than longer-term housing, the local authority must not ignore the individual circumstances of the homeless applicant that could make a particular placement unsuitable. As such, interim relief and permission were granted, requiring the Defendant to provide alternative suitable interim accommodation within 24 hours.

Olivia was instructed by Hannah Bellew at Lawstop.

<https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewhc/admin/2023/2675>

## **R (McPhee) v Secretary of State for Justice**

**[2024] EWHC 1247 (Admin)**

Olivia successfully represented the Claimant in this challenge to the Secretary of State for Justice's decision to reject the recommendation of the Parole Board to transfer the Claimant to open conditions.

It was found that the Defendant's decision did not provide good reason for rejecting the recommendation of the Parole Board. This was particularly in relation to further work to be undertaken by the Claimant. Notably, as the Claimant is subject to an IPP sentence and is significantly over-tariff, it was found that "*the importance of engaging properly with the manner*



*in which further progress is both to be achieved and to be demonstrated is all the greater where, as here, the prisoner is significantly post-tariff”.*

As a result of the judgment, the Defendant’s decision has been quashed and remitted back to the Defendant for reconsideration.

Olivia was instructed by Scott Laing at Bhatia Best Solicitors.

<https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewhc/admin/2024/1247>

## **R (McKilligan) v Parole Board for England and Wales**

**[2024] EWHC 336 (Admin)**

Olivia successfully represented the Claimant in this challenge to the Parole Board’s decision to refuse an oral hearing.

The Parole Board’s decision was found to be unreasonable and irrational and was therefore quashed, and an oral hearing directed. There are some interesting points in the judgment regarding the Claimant’s stagnation within the system and the need for a proper review of risk, failure to properly apply *Osborn*, and an unlawful dossier underpinning the decision as per the case of *Bailey and Morris*.

Olivia was instructed by Scott Laing at Bhatia Best Solicitors

<https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewhc/admin/2024/336>

## **R (NS) v Secretary of State for the Home Department**

**[2023] EWHC 2675 (Admin)**

Olivia, led by Chris Buttler KC, successfully represented a vulnerable asylum seeker who had been moved to inadequate accommodation a considerable distance from his support network.

In the judgment, Mr Justice Saini found that two separate decisions made by the SSHD to move the Claimant to accommodation away his support network were unlawful, stating “the decisions in this case were plainly reached by way of an unlawful process” at [39].

There were also important remarks made in the judgment about the SSHD’s failure to provide any evidence during the course of proceedings, as well as well-deserved recognition for the work done by the Claimant’s support worker and counsellor.



Olivia was instructed by Frank Bowmaker and Derek Bernardi at Lawstop.

<https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewhc/admin/2023/2675>

## **R (Parul) v Secretary of State for the Home Department**

**[2022] EWHC 2143 (Admin)**

Olivia acted for the Claimant, challenging the SSHD's unreasonable delay in relocating the Claimant to adequate accommodation.

The Claimant was provided with accommodation under Section 4(2) Immigration and Asylum Act 1999. She suffered from multiple chronic and complex medical conditions. The SSHD had accepted she needed to be relocated, but there had been a delay of 146 days at the date of the hearing in moving the Claimant.

The delay by the SSHD was found to be unlawful and had led to an imminent breach of Article 3. Important findings were also made regarding the evidence the Court would expect to see from the SSHD to support a defence in cases similar to this and the cases of R (Princess Bell) v London Borough of Lambeth [2022] EWHC 2008 (Admin) and R (Elkundi) v Birmingham City Council and ors [2022] 3 WLR 71, setting out the principles governing the grant of a mandatory order for breach of Section 193 main housing duty were applied when considering a mandatory order in the context of the SSHD failing to provide suitable accommodation in breach of her Section 4(2) duty.

Olivia was instructed by Priscilla Adu-Boahen at Lawstop.

<https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewhc/admin/2022/2143>

