

**Muneeb Akram: Barrister (Call: 2016)  
Former Solicitor (2011 to 2017)**

---

**APPOINTMENTS**

- Attorney General's Panel Counsel – Regional C Panel member from March 2020 to February 2025
- Qualified Legal Representative under Section 31W(6) of the Matrimonial and Family Proceedings Act 1984, and Section 85K(6) of the Courts Act 2003.

**EDUCATION**

- ❖ University College London: 2018, *LLM Masters in International Law*, Merit (2.1).
- ❖ BPP law School, London: 2016, *Higher Courts (Criminal Advocacy) Qualification*.
- ❖ Manchester Metropolitan University: 2011, *Bar Vocational Course, Very Competent*: Civil Advocacy (82%), Civil Litigation (82%), Criminal Advocacy (78%), Criminal Litigation (80%), Opinion Writing (91%), Conferencing (85%), Negotiation (80%), Personal Injury (74%), Employment Law (74%).
- ❖ Oxford Institute of Legal Practice, Oxford: 2005-2006, *Legal Practice Course, Commendation*.
- ❖ Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester: 2002-2005, *LLB Law (Hons) Degree, 2.1*.

**BARRISTER EXPERIENCE**

**Eadala Chambers, Barrister: July 2020 – ongoing**

**The Barrister Group, Barrister: November 2022 – ongoing**

**5 Pump Court Chambers, Barrister: June 2025 - ongoing**

**Trinity Chambers (Newcastle), Barrister: June 2019 – June 2020**

**New Walk Chambers (Leicester), Barrister: June 2017 – June 2019**

Muneeb has a broad public, regulatory, employment, civil and Human Rights law practice, with particular expertise in proceedings involving departmental government bodies. He is distinguished for the scrupulous preparation of his cases and for the extraordinary calibre of his advocacy and advisory services.

Muneeb has the ability to assimilate complex evidence and to explain complex legal issues to his clients, in a readily understandable format. He has significant experience of drafting written, legal submissions in preparation for hearings. Muneeb has demonstrable experience of conducting advocacy before courts and tribunals, including conducting witness handling duties and making oral, legal submissions. He is adept at exercising resilience and responding calmly and flexibly, in challenging circumstances. He inspires the confidence of his clients and remains authoritative, even when challenged during trials or hearings.

Muneeb is an excellent communicator, both in relation to his verbal and his written communication skills. He is also experienced at advising clients promptly about errant court or tribunal decisions, which have a prospect of being successfully challenged. He maintains extensive and up to date knowledge of legislation, case law and guidance, in relation to his areas of practice.

**EMPLOYMENT LAW**

Muneeb represents employee and employer clients across the UK, before the Employment Tribunal, and Employment Appeal Tribunal. He acts for claimants, respondents and trade unions in all aspects of employment law, including discrimination, harassment and victimisation claims, wrongful and unfair dismissal cases, claims for unpaid wages and equal pay claims. Muneeb has conducted a range of employment discrimination matters, including race discrimination, as well as direct and indirect discrimination claims. In particular, Muneeb has conducted employment tribunal cases dealing with a range of issues, including the following:

- Unlawful deduction of wages claims arising from Section 13 of the Employment Rights Act 1996, which refers to “*wages properly payable*” by an employer to an employee;
- Continuity of employment contracts and consideration of an employee’s terms and conditions of service, including public sector employee claims;
- Breach of contract claims and considering whether such a claim “*arises or is outstanding on the termination of the employee’s employment*”, applying Article 3 (c) of the Industrial Tribunals Extension of Jurisdiction (England and Wales) Order 1994;
- Consideration of a claimant’s employment status, including consideration of whether a contract between a claimant and respondent, was one of service within the meaning of Section 230(1) of the Employment Rights Act 1996;

- Consideration of whether a claimant was a worker within the meaning of Section 203(3)(b) of the Employment Rights Act 1996;
- Claims that a claimant was an employee for the purposes of Section 83 of the Equality Act 2010;
- Claims that a claimant was a worker for the purpose of Regulation 2 of the Working Time Regulations 1998;
- Claims for pregnancy discrimination pursuant to Section 83(2) of the Equality Act 2010, including consideration of the two stage test in discrimination claims, as set down by the Court of Appeal in **Wong v Igen Ltd [2005] EWCA Civ 142**;
- Direct disability discrimination claims under Section 13 of the Equality Act 2010, including consideration of issues of “*less favourable*” treatment, an actual or hypothetical comparator, and establishing the reason for the alleged unfavourable treatment and whether an alleged discriminator acted “*because of*” a protected characteristic;
- Discrimination arising from disability claims under Section 15 of the Equality Act 2010, including consideration of issues of “*unfavourable treatment*”, “*because of something arising in consequence of the Claimant’s disability*”, and “*proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim*”;
- An employer’s knowledge of disability and whether the employer “*did not know, and could not reasonably have been expected to know*”, that the Claimant had “*the disability*”, under Section 15(2) of the Equality Act 2010;
- Claims involving reasonable adjustments under Sections 20, 21 and 22 of the Equality Act 2010;
- Harassment related to disability claims under Section 26 of the Equality Act 2010, including consideration of “*unwanted conduct*”, “*related to a relevant protected characteristic*”, “*violating dignity*” and “*offensive environment*”;
- Victimisation claims under Section 27 of the Equality Act 2010, including consideration of “*detriment*” and whether any detriment is because of a protected act;
- Compensation claims for holiday pay and rest periods under the Working Time Regulations 1998;
- Claims for and calculation of, statutory redundancy pay;
- Claims for unfair dismissal, pursuant to Section 98(1) of the Employment Rights Act 1996, including consideration of the reasonableness of the dismissal;
- Sex discrimination claims, pursuant to Section 39 of the Equality Act 2010; and
- Whistleblowing and detriment claims, including under Section 47B of the Employment Rights Act 1996.

## IMMIGRATION AND ASYLUM

Muneeb has been instructed in an array of immigration and asylum cases, on behalf of both appellants and respondents, including cases for the UK Home Office. His demonstrable expertise in this area covers all aspects of asylum and trafficking, deportation, human rights, EU free movement, detention and bail, family and spouse visas and private immigration work.

Muneeb has appeared regularly before the First-Tier and Upper (Immigration and Asylum) Tribunal, conducting a range of substantive and appeal hearings. He advises regularly on the prospects of an appeal or judicial review of tribunal decisions, including drafting grounds of appeal and advices.

Muneeb also appears before the Administrative Court and the Upper Tribunal for oral permission hearings and substantive appeal hearings, in judicial review proceedings. Some of Muneeb’s recent immigration, judicial review hearings were as follows:

1. Upper Tribunal, Oral Permission Hearing: Muneeb was instructed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department (“SSHD”) where permission was granted on one of the applicant’s grounds. Muneeb subsequently advised the SSHD that he should reconsider the level of involvement of the Applicant as might lead to the attention of the Ethiopian authorities, on the basis of the country guidance case of **AAR (OLF - MB confirmed) Ethiopia CG [2022] UKUT 00001 (IAC)** and particularly Paragraph 3 of the Judgment Headnote, which reads as follows:  
“3) “*Significant*” should not be read as denoting a very high level of involvement or support. Rather, it relates to suspicion being established that a person is perceived by the authorities as possessing an anti-government agenda. This is a fact sensitive assessment”;
2. Administrative Court, Oral Permission Hearing: The applicant sought to argue that the SSHD could determine on a case by case basis, whether a country is safe. Section 94 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 requires the SSHD to certify a claim, if satisfied that the applicant is entitled to reside in a country contained in the Section 94 list. The Claimant relied upon provisions in various materials and sought to extract from them a picture of lack of safety and police and other official corruption, in Albania. Whilst it was found that Albania had problems regarding corruption, Muneeb successfully argued that the caseworker was simply applying Section 94, as Albania was on the safe list at the time of the decision taken. The caseworker could do no more than to certify the claim under Section 94, unless satisfied that the asylum claim was “*not clearly unfounded*”. Muneeb also responded to the applicant’s reliance upon the Supreme Court’s Judgment in **Jamar Brown (Jamaica) [2015] UKSC 8** and cited Paragraph 22 of that Judgment, as follows:

*“For a serious risk of persecution to exist in general, ie as a general feature of life in the relevant country, it must be possible to identify a recognisable section of the community to whom it applies”.*

Muneeb also relied upon the operative provisions of the Nationality and Borders Act 2022 (sections 30 to 38 thereof) in relation to interpretation of the refugee Convention. Permission was refused by the Administrative Court; and

3. Administrative Court, Substantive Appeal Hearing: Whilst Muneeb’s SSHD client agreed to reconsider his decision in this case, Muneeb advised his client that in **Alam & Anor v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2023] EWCA Civ 30**, the Court of Appeal considered the relevance of the decision in **Chikwamba v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2008] UKHL 40**. Further, that in **Alam** it was found that when an application for leave to remain is refused in reliance on the ground that the applicant is required to leave the UK and then make an entry clearance application, full consideration and weighting of Article 8 factors is still necessary. When such a weighing exercise is carried out, it may still be proportionate and lawful for the SSHD to decide that an applicant must leave the UK and then make an entry clearance application.

## **INQUIRIES AND INQUESTS**

Muneeb has in depth knowledge of coronial law and has demonstrable experience of appearing before HM Coroners’ Court. He handles all inquest instructions with particular sensitivity and compassion, whilst working to achieve the best possible outcome for the instructing party or interested person.

Muneeb is able to advise on all stages of the inquest process, from disclosure and investigation, to potential adverse findings and the ambit of the inquest and whether an Article 2 inquest should be held. He has represented various interested parties including NHS trusts, care homes, individual doctors, those within a prison setting, and bereaved family members.

Muneeb has thorough, up to date knowledge of applicable legislation, including *The Coroners (Inquests) Rules 2013*, as well as relevant case law and guidance relating to coroner’s duties. He has recently refreshed his memory of the *Competences for lawyers practising in the Coroners’ Courts* guidance, produced in conjunction with the Bar Standards Board. Some of the inquest cases that Muneeb has been instructed in, are as follows:

1. Muneeb represented a family member of the deceased prisoner at an Article 2 inquest before a jury, spanning a full week. He conducted full and thorough questioning of witnesses, including prison officers, particularly surrounding the supply and tracing of drugs into the prison;
2. Muneeb appeared before HM Coroners’ Court on behalf of a doctor, who had been made a separate, interested person in the proceedings. Muneeb examined carefully, relevant medical records and held detailed discussions with the doctor. The family had intimated that the doctor had directly cause the patient’s death. Muneeb sought to establish to the contrary and each NHS witness (including other doctors and consultants) were carefully questioned by him, to establish the events leading up to the doctor's involvement and the patient’s death; and
3. Muneeb appeared before HM Coroner concerning an inquest into the death of a patient, under the care of the Oncology Department of an NHS Foundation Trust. An operation had been carried out by the Trust approximately 2 years earlier to remove a Grade II Meningioma, brain tumour. The patient remained under the care of the Trust and underwent brain scans every few months, to monitor for any potential regrowth. The outsourced company with responsibility for preparing the radiologists reports, had failed to prepare a report of the last brain scan showing the aggressive tumour regrowth. The patient next attended the Hospital via the Emergency Department, having fallen at home and having fractured her hip, due to the disorientation caused by the tumour regrowth. When an emergency brain scan was then conducted, it was discovered that the tumour regrowth was too advanced to offer any life-saving treatment and only palliative care could be administered. The patient died several weeks later, due to the advanced brain tumour.

Muneeb was concerned that a prevention of future death report may be given by HM Coroner. He therefore requested that witness statements be obtained from the NHS Trust’s witnesses, addressing the outsourcing company’s failure and the measures put in place to ensure that brain scans and reports were not missed by the Trust in future. Muneeb then elicited this evidence at the inquest and made a point of methodically taking his witnesses through the Trust’s Investigation Report. They explained the measures that had since been implemented by the Trust to ensure that patient scans were not missed in future. Muneeb persuasively alluded to these measures in his closing submissions to the Coroner, who confirmed that she was “*just about*” persuaded by the measures put in place by the NHS Trust and that she was not therefore going to make a prevention of future death report, thus avoiding adverse publicity for Muneeb’s client.

## PERSONAL INJURY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Muneeb is routinely instructed as a trial advocate, in relation to both fast track and multi track cases. He conducts road traffic accident, occupiers liability, employers liability and holiday sickness claims. He has a particular aptitude for advancing and defending arguments of fundamental dishonesty, as well as dealing with technical, credit hire points.

Muneeb conducts complex unlawful detention cases, including drafting statements of case and preparing advices in high value claims for damages for false imprisonment. He is routinely instructed to conduct interlocutory hearings, CCMCs and trials of unlawful detention claims. One of Muneeb's clients recently commented as follows: *"He is excellent on his preparation and conduct of legal argument both orally and in writing, his advices have not simply been sufficient but are also detailed regarding facts of the cases he has handled for me. He has demonstrated both sound judgement and clear litigation strategy"*.

Muneeb's unlawful detention cases primarily arise out of immigration detention and have included consideration of the following legal principles:

- The SSHD's powers to detain for removal, under the Immigration Act 1971, applying Schedule 2, Paragraph 16 and Section 33 thereof;
- Chapter 55 of the Enforcement Instructions and Guidance and successor Detention Instructions;
- Article 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights;
- The Hardial Singh principles, reaffirmed in **R (I) v SSHD [2002] EWCA Civ 888**;
- Deportation of foreign criminals and the operative provisions of sections 32 and 36 of the UK Border Act 2007, as well as Schedule 3 to the Immigration Act 1971;
- Adults at Risk, applying the SSHD's policy, entitled *"Adults at risk in immigration detention"*;
- Unaccompanied children including considering the 'age in fact' point, applying **The Queen (on the application of AA) v SSHD [2017] EWCA Civ 138** and **BF (Eritrea) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2021] UKSC 38**;
- Limitation issues and advising clients that the cause of action in the tort of false imprisonment accrues afresh on a continuing basis, so that time runs afresh each day, until the detention / imprisonment ends; applying the Supreme Court decision in **Jalla v Shell International Trading and Shipping Co Ltd [2023] UKSC 16**, at [31], where it was stated as follows: *"...continuing nuisance is in principle no different from any other continuing tort or civil wrong. So, for example, in Coventry v Apsley (1691) 2 Salk 420 the tort of false imprisonment (trespass to the person), which is actionable per se, was continuing so that there was a continuing cause of action for as long as the false imprisonment carried on (ie for as long as there was the repetition of the imprisoning conduct)"*;
- Section 55 of the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act 2009 and a child's 'best interest' assessment;
- The Supreme court's decision in **R (on the application of Hemmati and others) v SSHD [2019] UKSC 56** and the Dublin III Regulations;
- Modern slavery and human trafficking, and the expectation in the SSHD's Guidance (*Home Office Modern Slavery: Statutory Guidance*) following a positive reasonable ground decision, that it can take significantly longer than 45 calendar days for a conclusive grounds decision to be made; thus affecting the decision to detain / continue to detain;
- Quantum of damages awards, including consideration of expert evidence and the Judicial College Guidelines in cases involving psychiatric injury;
- Aggravated damages awards, applying **Thompson v Commissioner of Police [1998] QB 498**; and
- Exemplary damages awards, applying **Rookes v Barnard [1964] A.C. 1129**.

Muneeb previously conducted work for the Government Legal Department (*"the GLD"*), having been appointed to the Attorney-General's Civil Panel Counsel from 2020 to 2025. His expertise includes dealing with personal injury claims, Human Rights Act claims, Data Protection Act claims, Equality Act claims and appeals against penalties for illegal workers / clandestine entrants. Some examples of the work that Muneeb has completed for his clients include the following:

1. Muneeb provided detailed advice to his client, in relation to a claim for damages under the Human Rights Act 1998. This case concerned an alleged breach of Section 4 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 and in particular the SSHD's duties: (i) to consider and make a decision on a Section 4(2) application within a reasonable period of time and, if the application is granted; (ii) to source accommodation within a reasonable period of time.

Muneeb advised his client that where delay is so significant, that delay will amount to a breach of the duty to act within a reasonable time. He advised that in relation to the delay of 6 weeks, from the grant of Section 4 accommodation and support, to the claimant finally being placed within Section 4 accommodation, it was so significant, in circumstances where accommodation had been found earlier and in circumstances where there were two errors relating to the collection of the Claimant, that the delay amounted to a breach of the duty to act within a reasonable time.

Muneeb provided extremely helpful quantum advice to his client, on the likely measure of damages for breach of Section 4 and Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights;

2. Muneeb provided a skeleton argument and representation at an appeal hearing, brought under the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006 (*“the 2006 Act”*), against a civil penalty notice imposed by the SSHD. In his skeleton argument, Muneeb set out the relevant statutory provisions (including applicable primary and secondary legislation), the applicable provisions of the *Code of practice on preventing illegal working: Right to Work Scheme for employers*, and applicable caselaw. Muneeb supplemented his skeleton argument with coherent and structured oral submissions, before the court. The appeal was dismissed and Muneeb recovered his client’s costs, in connection with defending the appeal; and
3. Muneeb defended a prison in a claim for damages, involving a prisoner-on-officer assault. He argued that whilst there was undoubtedly a duty on the defendant to take reasonable care to protect his employees against a reasonably foreseeable risk of injury, that duty extended only so far as the defendant taking steps that were reasonable and practicable. Muneeb relied on applicable, leading caselaw and argued that that the defendant was entitled to strike a balance *“between the need for control of the risk posed by the prison population and what are considered reasonable and acceptable conditions of incarceration”*: **Hill v Ministry of Justice [2022] EWHC 370**. He further contended that the offending prisoner had neither a known propensity to violence, nor any animosity towards the claimant. Muneeb expertly drew out the pieces of evidence and applied them to the applicable authorities (for example: **Lloyd v Ministry of Justice [2007] EWHC 2475**), in his skeleton argument.

### **PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE AND REGULATORY**

Muneeb has in-depth knowledge of regulatory law and he has experience of conducting a range of hearings before healthcare regulators. He is adept at identifying and applying relevant law and evidence, in regulatory proceedings. In particular, he has substantial experience of healthcare regulatory matters, including proceedings before the Nursing and Midwifery Council, the General Dental Council, the Health and Care Professions Council and the Medical Practitioners Tribunal Service.

Muneeb has experience of advising on and constructing cases at the investigation stage of the process, involving registrants’ fitness to practise. He has been instructed to appear before the respective tribunal and conduct advocacy for the regulatory body or registrant, at both substantive hearings and interim orders hearings. Some examples of Muneeb’s work in this area of law, are as follows:

1. Muneeb was instructed to represent a healthcare registrant, charged with a number of sexual offences against children. The registrant had stood trial in a criminal court and had been found not guilty of all charges. An interim suspension order had been placed on his practice by his healthcare regulatory body. Muneeb submitted a skeleton argument, outlining the relevant points for the tribunal to consider. Firstly, Muneeb pointed out that an interim suspension order was a temporary measure and that the registrant had been subject to this order for over 2 years. Secondly, applying the regulator’s guidance document, the decision to impose an interim suspension order was not to be taken lightly and was a *“draconian”* measure. Muneeb argued that preventing practice had had serious implications for and caused extreme prejudice to, the registrant. Thirdly, applying the European Convention on Human Rights, the regulator was required to conduct a proportionate balancing exercise between the need for an interim order against the consequences for the registrant, including financial and other impacts on the registrant. The tribunal agreed and removed the registrant’s interim suspension order;
2. Muneeb was instructed by the Nursing and Midwifery Council in relation to a case involving allegations of neglect by a nurse, including discharging a patient to a residential care home with insufficient information in their care plan, not taking patient observations, and not administering medication to patients. Muneeb elicited evidence from the NMC’s witnesses and the panel found the majority of the allegations proved, at the fact finding stage. Muneeb successfully persuaded the panel that both misconduct and impairment of the registrant’s fitness to practise should be found. The panel then imposed a conditions of practice order on the registrant, for a period of 12 months; and
3. Muneeb appeared on behalf of a healthcare regulator, in a case involving allegations of sexual misconduct. Muneeb placed reliance on applicable caselaw in this area, including **Basson v General Medical Council [2018] EWHC 505 (Admin)**, where Mr Justice Mostyn stated that in proceedings of this nature: *“the state of a person’s mind is not something that can be proved by direct observation. It can only be proved by inference or deduction from the surrounding evidence”*. Muneeb also relied on **Haris v General Medical Council [2021] EWCA Civ 763** where the tribunal had found that the qualified medical doctor must have been aware that: (a) what he was touching were sexual organs (b) a record must be kept of any intimate touching of that nature in the context of a clinical consultation and (c) he should have obtained the patient’s prior consent.