Laura Bumpus

Call: 2008

E	clerks@dekachambers.com
T	+44(0)20 7832 0500

Laura Bumpus has built a busy and established practice in the Family Court and Court of Protection, choosing to specialise her career in these two overlapping jurisdictions.

She has an entirely paperless practice and currently conducts all court hearings, round table meetings and conferences remotely.

Laura is a confident and adaptable advocate who strikes the balance between tenacity before the tribunal and pragmatism in advising clients. She is often praised by lay and professional clients alike for her ability to give clear, practical advice whilst always remaining professional and approachable. She has been recognised for her down to earth and pragmatic approach to sensitive and often emotionally stressful situations for parents.

She has advocated in both the High Court and Court of Appeal.

Areas of Expertise

Children Law

Instructed on behalf of local authorities, parents and guardians alike, Laura specialises in all areas of complex law relating to children. She represents clients in relation to cases of international surrogacy, jurisdictional issues and non-accidental injury including fabricated and induced illness. She has extensive experience in representing vulnerable parents and the impact of mental health issues and cognitive impairments on parenting capacity.

Laura's Court of Protection practice provides her with a distinct advantage in relation to all aspects of deprivation of liberty safeguarding matters and issues of capacity in the family courts.

Notable Children Law cases

LBHF v DB [2020]

Deka Chambers
5 Norwich Street
London
EC4A 1DR

T: +44 (0)20 7832 0500
E: clerks@dekachambers.com
DX: LDE 439

This case concerned 3 full siblings born by 2 alleged surrogate mothers. The father was Italian, the first mother was Moldovan and the second mother was Georgian. Laura succeeded in gaining final orders in favour of her client, the mother of the eldest two children to whom she gave birth in Argentina and England, by establishing findings against the father of coercive control and long standing emotional abuse. Laura continues to advise and act in relation to the mother's application for a parental order in respect of her youngest child born by surrogacy in Georgia.

Re L (A Child) [2017] EWHC 3707 (Fam) Francis J

This High Court case involved proceedings as a result of the death of a 10 year old child within a 6 child sibling group. There was a concurrent investigation by the police leading to voluminous police disclosure prior to, and throughout, the 3 week final hearing. Medical evidence in relation to causation was complex and contradictory between experts and arguments over the discharge of burden of proof followed. The outcome of the initial final hearing was successfully appealed twice (by the local authority and then by the parents) leading to 2 further fully contested final hearings in the High Court.

LBI v D [2020]

Proceedings were issued as a result of the father sharing with work colleagues a video of a baby being sexually abused. The mother was unconcerned as to the video. The father's IQ was 63 and the mother was borderline range for a learning disability. There was significant extended familial conflict and a history of chronic neglect of the mother from her own childhood. The 5 day final hearing was adjourned following extensive evidence that cast light on the nature of further assessment and support which could negate the LA care plan for care and placement orders.

LBS v S [2021]

This case involved legal argument over the appropriate legal framework for a local authority to arrange vaccinations for children subject to an interim care orders against their parents' wishes. The mother's application for injunctive relief under the court's inherent jurisdiction had been made prior to the Court of Appeal's judgment in Re H (A Child)(Parental Responsibility: Vaccination) [2020]. Laura successfully advocated that the local authority were, as holders of interim care orders, entitled to make decisions about vaccinations under s.33(3)(b) CA1989, going on to deal with the issue of alleged contra-indications specific to immunisations and the necessity of expert evidence.

LBI v D [2021]

Laura represented 3 respondent children in care proceedings as a result of the mother's chronic neglect. At the conclusion of the 5 day final hearing, prior to Judgment, allegations of historical sexual assault were levied against the father by mother's adult child, B. It was known that L, B's friend, had made similar allegations against the father historically (which B had refuted at the time). There followed complex police disclosure and a further 5 days fact finding whereby the court found the allegations of sexual harm had been made out against the father. The local authority's initial care plan to place all 3 children with the father was amended to placement with long term foster carers.

Deka Chambers
5 Norwich Street
London
EC4A 1DR

T: +44 (0)20 7832 0500
E: clerks@dekachambers.com
DX: LDE 439

Court of Protection

Laura Court of Protection practice goes from strength to strength. She accepts instructions from private individuals, protected persons, the office of the Public Guardian, deputies, health boards and local authorities. She represents clients in all aspects of litigation in relation to of Health & Welfare and Property & Finances.

Laura's children law practice in the Family Courts has provided her with valuable experience and breadth of knowledge between the 2 jurisdictions particularly in relation to complex issues around assessment of capacity, consent and deprivation of liberty, including DOLS.

Notable Court of Protection cases

Southwark v AS [2021]

Laura represents the 4th respondent AE in ongoing proceedings who has provided care to P for more than 10 years. Proceedings were brought by AE's estranged sisters who seek i) to challenge the LPA in relation to property an affairs in favour of AE and ii) a best interests decision that P lives with them. Issues of AE's daughter's own mental health and volatility have been relevant to the court's interim decisions. Notwithstanding this, Laura has successfully argued that there should be no interim change of care pending final hearing and P should at present remain living with AE.

LBE v JM [2016]

The court heard complex legal argument over whether JM's recent improved presentation meant she was no longer entitled to continuing health care and, if she was entitled to it, which Care Commissioning Group would be legally responsible for commissioning JM's care. A best interests decision required the competing opinions of 2 experts to be tested at final hearing resulting in a decision for JM to remain living in the family home with 24 hour professional carers being present.

Education

- Graduate Diploma in Law, College of Law, London
- Bar Vocational Course, College of Law London
- LLM, College of Law, London

Memberships

- Family Law Bar Association

Deka Chambers
5 Norwich Street
London
EC4A 1DR

T: +44 (0)20 7832 0500
E: clerks@dekachambers.com
DX: LDE 439

- Association of Lawyers for Children
- Court of Protection Bar Association

Accreditation Logos

Deka Chambers
5 Norwich Street
London
EC4A 1DR

T: +44 (0)20 7832 0500
E: clerks@dekachambers.com
DX: LDE 439