

**In the Consistory Court of the Diocese of Coventry**

**Parish of Radford**

**Churchyard of St Nicholas, Radford**

**Re: Wilfred Bullingham (deceased)**

**and**

**Re: Annie Mary Alice Lillian Bullingham (deceased)**

**Gillian Ogilvie (Mrs) Petitioner**

**Private Petitions for permission to exhume cremated remains.**

1. There are before the Court two petitions, each seeking the exhumation of cremated remains from the consecrated Churchyard of St Nicholas, which comes under the responsibility of the Incumbent of the Parish of Radford.
2. For the state of expediency, I ordered joinder of the two petitions so that I could issue a single set of directions, where I required only a single response to each direction, rather than having a separate document for each petition.

**Overview**

3. Annie M.A.L. Bullingham sadly died in October 1991 and that same month her cremated remains were interred in the consecrated Garden of Rest within St Nicholas' churchyard. Wilfred Bullingham subsequently died in April 2001 and his cremated remains were interred in the same plot as his Wife's ashes, but in a separate casket. A memorial stone was placed over the interment plot giving the details of those interred and ending 'Eternally together'.
4. Subsequently St Nicholas' Church ceased to be a place of worship and was then demolished, although the Garden of Rest remains consecrated, and there is some mention that a former Church hall (still, it seems, used for Anglo-Catholic services) remains on the site. The petitioner has made comment about anti-social behaviour in the area of the Garden of Rest.

5. The Petitioner seeks permission to exhume the cremated remains of each of her parents so they can be taken to Oakley Wood Crematorium, where there is apparently a family memorial bench. The petitioner has cited the difficulty of travelling to St Nicholas' churchyard as her principal reason for the petition to exhume. She also, as I have indicated, expressed personal dissatisfaction at the upkeep of the Garden of Rest where the interments had taken place, and the anti-social behaviour that she stated took place at that location (albeit there has been no evidence produced to the Court to support this assertion).
6. Each petition contains a statement that the Petitioner wishes to keep the 'gravestone'. There has been no specific prayer for permission to remove the memorial stone in either petition. In issuing directions I specifically directed that each petition should be deemed to include a request to remove and relocate the memorial stone.
7. With the petition in relation to Wilfred Bullingham was included a letter from the Bereavement Officer for Oakley Wood Crematorium wherein was mention that the intention is to scatter the ashes of the deceased in the grounds of the Crematorium. That proposition was not expressed as the likely means of dealing with the remains of the departed in either petition.
8. The Incumbent responsible for Radford Parish signed each petition to state that she would provide any necessary consent to the exhumations. I am even now uncertain whether the Incumbent was ever informed that the intention was to scatter the ashes following exhumation, rather than to seek re-interment elsewhere.

#### **Further information arising from directions of the Court**

9. In the written directions of the Court the petitioner was required to provide the following information :
  - (a) her intentions for the cremated remains of her parents at Oakley Wood Crematorium, specifying whether it is intended the ashes be scattered or interred;
  - (b) if burial of the ashes is to be sought, whether it is intended that the ashes be kept separate, as when originally interred, or combined, and within what type of container (specifying whether it is intended a biodegradable material be used or not);
  - (c) her intentions for the memorial stone commemorating her parents;
  - (d) if scattering of the ashes is proposed, whether that was explained to the incumbent of the Parish of Radford when she was asked to sign the consent to seek exhumation.Also, within the directions the petitioner was invited, if she wished, to expand upon her reasoning and justification for seeking the exhumations beyond that already contained in the two petitions.  
A further direction stated that if the Petitioner wishes to seek scattering of the

ashes of her parents, she should provide explanation why she now intends that form of disposal after having originally sought interment of the cremated remains of each parent.

10. The response in writing from the Petitioner as to methodology was to explain it was proposed the exhumation should be carried out by a gravedigger, the cremated remains should be kept in their original containers (which she asserted “would have been lead lined”) and then taken by herself to Oakley Wood Crematorium, where decision would be made as to whether there would be interment or scattering, depending upon the state of the original containers. Any interment would be at the bench commemorating the petitioner’s husband.
11. As regards reasoning for the relocation of the cremated remains, the Petitioner asserted in effect that she should have been consulted before the Church building was demolished, as the location for interment had been selected because of her Parents’ long association with the building, rather than the location. She further asserted that, apart from it being too far for her to travel to the Garden of Rest, her parents would have been happy for her to do with their remains what she thought right, whether that be scattering or interment, together or separately.
12. Concerning the memorial stone, the Petitioner’s daughter wrote on her behalf to state that as the memorial stone belonged to the family she didn’t see why the family should confirm their intentions as regards that stone, other than that they intended to remove it from the interment plot in the Garden of Rest. The Petitioner separately stated the memorial stone should stay with the ashes and asserted it would replace one of the concrete slabs at the site of the memorial bench at Oakley Wood Crematorium. Each communication showed a lack of understanding that a faculty would be required to permanently remove a memorial from consecrated ground, and the daughter clearly did not comprehend the requirement that, once such an item had been lawfully introduced to an area under the jurisdiction of the Consistory Court, the Petitioner would need to justify the removal of the object and therefore did need to explain what was intended.
13. There has been no response to the Direction that if scattering of ashes is proposed the Petitioner state whether that proposal was explained to the Incumbent when she was asked to provide her approval for the exhumation.
14. The directions included a requirement that the Funeral Director intended to oversee the exhumation and transportation of the cremated remains should explain the following: *as to methodology; the container within which each set of cremated remains would be transported to Oakley Wood Crematorium; and stating whether the cremated remains would be kept separate or combined.*

The petitioner’s daughter responded, somewhat tersely, that it had already been explained that a gravedigger would carry out the exhumation, then the family

would transport the cremated remains - in whatever state they may be found - to Oakley Wood Crematorium. She added that 'as we have completed all [necessary] paperwork the need and cost [of engaging funeral directors] was not needed' (*sic*).

15. The written directions also required information concerning the Crematorium: *as to the exact location to which it is intended the cremated remains of Annie Bullingham and Wilfred Bullingham be relocated, whether that area is consecrated and, if interment is proposed, whether permission would be given for the memorial stone to be placed over the place of interment*
16. When informed that the Diocesan Registry had written to Oakley Wood Crematorium to obtain the information required by the direction of the Court the Petitioner's daughter demanded to know why that task had been undertaken without the Petitioner's permission. I can see no fault in, or reasonable objection to, the Registry Clerk or the Registrar seeking to assist the Court and the petitioner in obtaining clarification (required by directions of the Court) from those responsible for the place where it is intended exhumed remains should be relocated, especially when those people had already entered into correspondence that left questions unanswered.
17. In response to correspondence from the Diocesan Registry the bereavements officer responsible for Oakley Wood Crematorium confirmed (a) that the area is not consecrated, (b) that the District Council did not permit interment of cremated remains at the Crematorium, and (c) that no permission would be given for the memorial stone to be relocated to the Crematorium, as no individual memorials are permitted there (explaining the woodland in question is a communal area that the District Council wished to keep as natural as possible). The only option at that location would therefore be scattering of the previously buried ashes.

#### **Churchyard regulations**

18. Since Easter Sunday 2025 new Churchyard regulations, incorporating nationally proposed memorial regulations, have applied in the Diocese of Coventry, and those regulations have been available on the Diocesan website since early January 2025. However, these petitions were lodged prior to Easter, so I have regard to the Churchyard regulations that applied beforehand. Both the now replaced Churchyard Regulations and those currently in place prohibit the strewing or scattering of cremated remains, although clearly those regulations would not be binding upon the Chancellor or his Deputy should good reason for strewing or scattering be put forward to justify such disposal.
19. Both now, and previously, it would not be permissible for a lead-lined casket to be used for the interment of cremated remains. All containers used for the interment of cremated remains have, for many years, been required to be in a form that will break down naturally after burial, or alternatively direct

distribution of ashes into the interment plot has been recommended. There has also been, and remains, a specific prohibition against placing within caskets or containers any material that is not bio-degradable, such as a plastic bag to contain the ashes within the casket. It therefore seems very unlikely that the Petitioner is correct to assert the caskets used for her parents would have been lead lined.

**Assumptions as to the state of the original caskets/containers**

20. It is now 24 years since the interment of Wilfred Bullingham's cremated remains, and 34 years since the interment of his Wife, Annie. From personal experience in these matters, it seems extremely unlikely that any casket or container used for the interment - if provided in accordance with the previous Churchyard regulations - would now remain intact and usable for transportation. It would seem likely, therefore, that the ashes of each of the deceased will now be mingled with the consecrated soil of the Garden of Rest and the remnants of the original casket. Any removal of the cremated remains would also inevitably involve removal of some consecrated earth. Although not, so far as I have been able to glean, a decided rule, it would seem appropriate that material including consecrated soil from one location should, wherever possible, be relocated to similarly consecrated ground.

**The Law**

21. The cremated remains of Annie and Wilfred Bullingham have been interred in ground consecrated according to the rites of the Church of England, and thus are subject to the jurisdiction of the Consistory Court. There is in law specific prohibition upon removing cremated remains from consecrated ground without permission by way of faculty. See section 25 of the Burial Act 1857 (as amended) which now provides as follows:

***25 Offence of removal of body from burial ground***

*(1) It is an offence for a body or any human remains which have been interred in a place of burial to be removed unless one of the conditions listed in subsection (2) is complied with.*

*(2) The conditions referred to in subsection (1) are—*

*(a) the body or remains is or are removed in accordance with a faculty granted by the court;*

*(b) the body or remains is or are removed in accordance with the approval of a proposal under the Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011 (No. 1) by the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England or a fabric advisory committee;*

*(c) unless the body or remains is or are interred in land which is subject to the jurisdiction of the court or its or their removal requires or require the approval of a proposal under the Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011, the body or remains is or are removed under a licence from the Secretary of State and in accordance with any conditions attached to the licence.*

(As an aside, it appears that until the enactment of section 2 of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2014 there remained a lacunae in the law that could have permitted the use of a Ministry of Justice licence to enable the exhumation, but the amended Burial Act clearly now shows that

jurisdiction does not apply - see also *R (on the application of HM Coroner for the Eastern District of London) v (1) Secretary of State for Justice and (2) Susan Sutovic and others* [2009] EWHC 1947 (Admin)).

22. There are a number of reported decisions on the issue of exhumation arising from Consistory Courts in both provinces (no doubt because the issue of exhumation is considered so important that a judgment will be required in many cases). The guiding principles are set out in two cases of the ecclesiastical appellate courts. The earlier case of *Re Christ Church Alsager* [1998] 3 WLR 1394 came from the Chancery Court of York. There the Court dismissed an appeal against the refusal of the Chancellor to permit an exhumation and reburial within the same churchyard in order that a married couple's remains could be buried together. There then followed the leading case of *Re Blagdon Cemetery* [2002] 3 WLR 603, which was a decision of the Court of Arches. There the court overturned a first instance decision to refuse permission for exhumation apparently on the grounds of the passage of time alone.
23. The test under *Alsager* is for the Chancellor to ask the following question:- *Is there a good and proper reason for exhumation, that reason being likely to be regarded as acceptable by right thinking members of the Church at large?* [see page 1401 paragraphs D to E].
24. Under the latter case of *Re Blagdon* the appropriate guiding principles were set out in paragraphs 33 and 34, as follows:-
  33. *We have concluded that there is much to be said for reverting to the straightforward principle that a faculty for exhumation will only be exceptionally granted. Exceptional means "forming an exception" (Concise Oxford Dictionary (8th Edition, 1990)) and guidelines can assist in identifying various categories of exception. Whether the facts in a particular case warrant a finding that the case is to be treated as an exception is for the chancellor to determine on the balance of probabilities.*
  34. *The variety of wording that has been used in judgments demonstrates the difficulty in identifying appropriate wording for a general test in what is essentially a matter of discretion. We consider that it should always be made clear that it is for the petitioner to satisfy the consistory court that there are special circumstances in his/her case which justify the making of an exception from the norm that Christian burial (that is burial of a body or cremated remains in a consecrated churchyard or consecrated part of a local authority cemetery) is final. It will then be for the chancellor to decide whether the petitioner has so satisfied him/her.*The presumption is therefore that burial of human remains in consecrated ground is permanent save in exceptional circumstances.
25. In *Blagdon* the Court of Arches was greatly assisted by The Right Reverend Christopher Hill (then Bishop of Stafford) in The Theology of Christian Burial

(as quoted in paragraph 23 of the judgment) where he explained this permanency:

*‘The funeral itself articulates very clearly that its purpose is to remember before God the departed; to give thanks for [his/her] life; to commend [him/her] to God the merciful redeemer and judge; to commit [his/her] body to burial/cremation and finally to comfort one another.’*

He went on to explain more generally that :

*‘The permanent burial of the physical body/the burial of cremated remains should be seen as a symbol of our entrusting the person to God for resurrection. We are commending the person to God, saying farewell to them (for their “journey”), entrusting them in peace for their ultimate destination, with us, the heavenly Jerusalem. This commending, entrusting, resting in peace does not sit easily with “portable remains”, which suggests the opposite: reclaiming, possession, and restlessness; a holding on to the ‘symbol’ of a human life rather than a giving back to God’.*

26. In *Blagdon* the Court of Arches then went on to explain the legal view of permanency thus :  
*“The general concept of permanence is reflected in the fact that it is a criminal offence to disturb a dead body without lawful permission. Moreover, the fact that there is no ownership of a dead body according to English law, and the absence of any legal right in English law or under the European Convention of Human Rights to exhume a body or cremated remains, reflects a culture in which the norm is that the remains of a dead person should not be disturbed once they have undergone the initial act of interment.”*
27. The above comments do not mean that exhumation cannot occur, but in *Blagdon* the Court expressed that there has to be some exceptional circumstance before the norm of permanent burial is set aside. The Court gave some guidance as to what could constitute exceptional circumstances. These factors include medical reasons supported by necessary psychiatric evidence (which do not apply here), or a mistake in the administration of the burial so that an important error in location had been made.
28. Another of the *Blagdon* categories of possible exception is exhumation in order to place a deceased person’s remains within a family grave. The question of what does and does not constitute a justifiable family grave case has been exhaustively considered in a number of reported judgments. There is acknowledged to be a need to avoid permitting an approach which renders the remains of deceased persons “portable” and therefore offending against both the theological concept of a burial representing a final entrustment of the deceased to God, and equally against the secular assumption of permanence. It is also clear that in this difficult and sensitive area the facts of each case must be carefully considered. The *Blagdon* judgment gave broad principles but it did not create any easily gleaned rules about particular situations.

29. It seems to me that under both *Alsager* and *Blagdon* the decision will depend upon the peculiar circumstances of each case, to which general principles can be applied.

30. **Other cases on Exhumation**

So that the petitioner can see consistency here with the approach applied in deciding upon other petitions, I give examples of cases where exhumation was permitted, and why, and where exhumation was refused, albeit each case clearly depends upon its own facts and would not bind my hand absolutely.

**Exhumation permitted**

(a) where there has been a mistake

*In the matter of Cyril Jones (Deceased) [2016] ECC Liv 4* - exhumation was permitted for reinterment elsewhere as there was no room in the Churchyard for the intended interment of the deceased's widow when she died.

*Re All Saints Barrowby [2019] ECC Lin 1* - there had been a mistaken belief that the funeral plot was deep enough to permit the burial of the deceased's wife's ashes when she too died. The Chancellor granted exhumation to allow the original intention of a joint grave.

*In the matter of Cottingley Hall Cemetery [2023] ECC Lee 1* - by an error of those controlling the cemetery the remains of the deceased had been interred in plot F227 instead of the family grave at F225. Exhumation and reinterment was appropriate

(b) Where there had been a change in circumstances applying to the grave or cremation plot itself

*Re All Saints Ladbroke [2016] ECC Cov 6* - an extension to the church had been built very close to this interment plot so that, several times, the upright memorial stone had been used as a step by those intent on stealing lead from the Church roof. Exhumation and relocation within the same churchyard was appropriate. The then Chancellor stated: "*This is wholly different from those cases where exhumation is sought for private purposes*".

*Re All Saints West Bromwich [2019] ECC Lic 1* - the interment was near a drain pipe that leaked and needed repair work that would cause disturbance to the interment plot. It was appropriate to permit exhumation and reinterment in the same churchyard but away from the drain.

(c) To create a family grave

*In the matter of the petition of Mandy Ramshaw [2016] ECC Oxf 1* - the Chancellor expressed that the desire to create a family grave was an exceptional circumstance that would permit exhumation. He did, however, require proof that the location of the proposed family grave had been duly reserved by faculty.

*In the matter of David Bell (Deceased) [2016] ECC She 4* - it was appropriate to grant exhumation for cremation of the body, to then allow reinterment elsewhere in order to create a family grave. The Chancellor also expressed satisfaction that the procedure would be supervised by experienced funeral directors and a member of the Clergy, who would ensure due reverence was applied to the whole procedure.



(d) Medical condition affecting the bereaved

*Re an application for an exhumation [2024] ECC Wor 2* - The Court received expert medical evidence from two practitioners showing that the removal of interred remains from a public cemetery to a private burial ground would have significant benefit for one of the bereaved. The Chancellor granted a faculty, subject to a condition that the remains of the father and son, after such a long period (nearly 50 years), could be identified and fully removed

**Permission to exhume refused**

*In the matter of Howard Charles Griffiths [2018] ECC Bir 1* - 27 years after burial the petitioner sought exhumation on the basis that the churchyard was not well kept and the interment plot was close to a fume-producing gas generator (that had been in place for 22 years). There had been no mistake made in the initial decision to inter the remains in consecrated ground and the petitioner had not acted swiftly if the cited gas governor and lack of maintenance were the real grounds for seeking exhumation.

*In the matter of the petition of Kathrine Tollis [2016] ECC Oxf 2* - the petitioner wished to exhume her late husband's ashes and send them for interment in Antibes, where he had lived for some time and which place the family all regularly visited. There had been no specific request of the deceased to be buried in Antibes - he had left the arrangements to the discretion of his widow. That 'change of mind' by the Widow did not amount to the exceptional circumstances needed to justify the exhumation.

*Re All Saints Allesley [2018] ECC Cov 10* - The petitioner had moved away from the area where her husband had been interred. She sought exhumation to bring him closer to where she now lived. 'A change of mind based upon a change of family circumstances' did not amount to exceptional circumstances.

**Where the intention was to scatter previously buried ashes**

*Re All Hallows Ordsall [2019] ECC S&N 1* - this was unusually a confirmatory faculty, where exhumation had already occurred subject to an incorrectly issued MOJ licence, rather than the required faculty. It made no sense to refuse a faculty to legitimise the exhumation that had already occurred. Although the intention had been to scatter the previously interred ashes, the Chancellor expressed a wish that the petitioner should change his mind and choose reinterment instead at a new location.

*In the matter of an application for the exhumation of the mortal remains of RM [2024] ECC Wor 5* - 39 years after burial the petitioner sought permission to exhume her Father's ashes so that they could be mixed with the ashes of the recently deceased Widow, who had never desired interment, and be scattered. There were no exceptional circumstances such as to justify exhumation. There had been no mistake made in originally seeking interment of the deceased.

*Re Sheringham Town Cemetery [2023] Ecc Nor 1* - The ashes of the petitioners' father had been interred in the cemetery in 2004 in a plot reserved for the ashes of him and his wife. Some years later, the petitioners' mother had decided that she did not wish her ashes to be buried with those of her husband, but wanted them scattered where she used to walk her dog. She had also expressed a wish that her husband's ashes be exhumed and scattered in the same place. The

petitioners' mother died in 2023. The Chancellor refused to grant a faculty to allow the ashes of the petitioners' father to be exhumed and scattered. There was no legal basis on which to justify exhumation. There had been no mistake as to the place of burial, but simply a change of mind after a long period of time, which was not a proper reason for allowing an exception to the general rule that burial should be regarded as final.

31. From the numerous cases on the subject of exhumation it seems that, unless the contrary can be proved, there should be an assumption that if the cremated remains of the deceased had originally been buried, rather than scattered, it was the desire of the deceased to be buried, rather than scattered.

**What the consistory court should expect**

32. It appears appropriate to here set out what, within the Diocese of Coventry, would generally be expected from those intent on seeking an exhumation.

- (a) First and foremost, before setting along the path of applying for a faculty for exhumation, the petitioner must obtain and read the Churchyard Regulations and the Handbook for the Bereaved. Both are readily available on the Diocesan website. It is important for any petitioner to understand the background of the likely approach to be applied by those determining any petition concerning interred remains;

- (b) Seeking exhumation is a very serious step and there are many pitfalls awaiting the uninitiated (such as here, where the Petitioner did not realise that the applications lodged would not, of themselves, permit her to remove the memorial stone over the interment plot if exhumation was permitted). Save perhaps in cases of mistake by those administering a churchyard or cemetery, it would always be advisable for anyone seeking exhumation to take appropriate expert legal advice.

- (c) The burden of proving exceptional circumstances so as to justify exhumation rests with the Petitioner. However, the Petitioner must ensure that the information supplied to the Court is both full and accurate. Where the Court has requested further clarification the Petitioner should endeavour to assist in the provision of the complete information sought.

- (d) Save where there has been only a very short time since interment, there should be expected to be some degradation to the casket, coffin or container within which mortal remains had been interred. For that reason alone, it is necessary that an assessment be carried out by a trained professional as to the likely state of the container that had been interred, so that a suitable container be available for the period the interred remains are out of the ground. It is also appropriate that the process of exhumation be carried out with due reverence, appropriately shielded from public view. For that reason, it would almost always be necessary to engage the services of an experienced funeral director, who could provide a report on the likely state of the container, assure the Court of the methods to be utilised in carrying out the exhumations and to provide entirely suitable means of transporting the exhumed remains to a new location, ensuring also the least possible removal of earth from the consecrated ground in which the

interment had taken place.

(e) Wherever possible the Minister or other official responsible for the churchyard or cemetery should undertake to supervise the exhumation, to provide suitable pastoral support to the bereaved and to ensure some suitable religious ceremony was undertaken at the time of exhumation and, if possible, reinterment.

33 **Determination**

In this matter it is true that the original Church building has been demolished, but that is an unusual circumstance, rather than being truly exceptional. The Garden of Rest remains in place, where cremated remains of numerous people have been interred, and where memorials to them have been set in place. The area remains consecrated and is dedicated to the memory of those interred there, and will remain so even if the proposed care home is built on the site of the original Church.

34. Of particular note, the Petitioner conceded that her principal reason for seeking exhumation was that she now finds it difficult to travel to Radford.
35. The information supplied to the Court has not been full and accurate. In particular, the further clarification from the Bereavement Officer at Oakley Wood Crematorium directly conflicts with many of the assertions made by the Petitioner. I take that to have been a misunderstanding by the Petitioner from what she hoped could be achieved and the reality of the situation.
36. There was no mistake in the original choice to inter the cremated remains of the Petitioner's Mother in consecrated ground at Radford. That is further supported by the later decision to also inter her Father's cremated remains in the same plot in the Garden of Rest. Over the interment plot was then raised a memorial stone to Annie and Wilfred, bearing also the legend 'Eternally Together'. That sentiment cannot be ignored. It was clearly the intention of Wilfred that he should be interred forever, in the same place as his Wife.
37. Now the Petitioner has effectively changed her mind and wants to move the remains to a place more convenient for her. I have to consider the issue of 'portability' of interred remains and the question of the presumption of permanence of burial in consecrated ground after a Christian burial.
38. It is possible that had those administering Oakley Wood Crematorium been willing to permit interment, and relocation of the memorial stone, I may have permitted exhumation to, effectively, create a family grave. However, that is not the circumstance with which I am presented.
39. If I was to grant the requested faculties there would be a direct conflict with the presumption of permanence of burial, with then there being no option available at Oakley Wood but to scatter the ashes of Annie Bullingham and Wilfred

Bullingham, together with whatever consecrated earth had also been removed with the ashes, in the unconsecrated woodland at the crematorium. I have no doubt that would be contrary to the wishes of the deceased, whose intent appears to have been that they be buried together, not scattered to the four winds.

40. Following the proposed arrangements, the memorial stone would then have no place to be kept, risking some confusion arising as to whether Annie and Wilfred were actually interred somewhere else. That is always to be discouraged, and is a reason why the Consistory Court should always be given compelling evidence as to why a memorial should be permanently removed and what should then occur with the original memorial.
41. There has been, of course, no assurance that any exhumation would be supervised by a trained professional and carried out with due reverence and with provision of a suitable container and appropriate means of transporting the cremated remains to a new location.
42. The burden has always been upon the Petitioner to satisfy the judge of the consistory court that there are exceptional circumstances in her case which justify the making of an exception from the norm that Christian burial is final. I regret to say that the petitioner has not persuaded me that there are good and proper reasons - let alone exceptional circumstances - so as to permit me to order the requested exhumations, or the removal of the memorial stone. Both petitions are therefore dismissed.
43. There will be no order of costs for preparation of this judgment, although I believe I am still required to certify it took just over five hours to consider the documents and draft this judgment. I also waive the Chancellor's fee arising from the giving of directions.

Glyn Samuel  
Diocesan Chancellor  
22<sup>nd</sup> May 2025.