temple garden chambers

Lionel Stride

Call 2005

lionelstride@tgchambers.com

+44 (0)20 7583 1315

Lionel is recognised as a compelling advocate, with phenomenal attention to detail and an ability to cut through a case to its essential details. The breadth of his practice means that he is often instructed on the most complex and valuable cases requiring expertise in multiple fields; and he is ranked as a Leading Junior in both Chambers and Partners (Band 1) and Legal 500 (Tier 2 for both Clinical Negligence and Personal Injury).

He has a highly diverse High Court and multi-track practice focused predominantly on serious and catastrophic personal injury (arising out of accidents at home and abroad), clinical negligence and group litigation (predominantly arising out of defective medical products), with complementary expertise in aviation (covering Montreal Convention cases, airline disasters both abroad and in the UK, as well as helicopter and light aircraft accidents) and product liability (particularly in the context of prosthetic and medical/surgical equipment failures but extending to other complex matters such as kit-made aircraft). Lionel regularly deals with cases valued well into seven figures and has a balanced case load acting for both claimants and defendants.

Lionel's broader practice encompasses regular work in the related fields of health & safety, costs, professional liability, insurance and civil fraud, both in an advisory and adversarial capacity. He provides a considered 'team' approach to litigation, tactical insight for JSMs and mediations and skilled advocacy. He is robust where required but also has the soft skills needed to handle sensitive cases in which a more judicious approach is needed.

Expertise

Personal Injury

Lionel acts for claimants and defendants in all areas of personal injury. He is the current editor of the Accidents Abroad chapter in Bingham's Personal Injury and Motor Claims Cases and regularly instructed as sole counsel in seven figure fatal and catastrophic injury cases at home and abroad, the latter being associated with jurisdictional (application of the Brussels Regulations) and/or applicable law (Rome II) issues.

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

Lionel has particular experience in claims involving polytrauma, limb amputations (upper and lower), spinal cord and brain injuries and/or other significant disability. His case load encompasses injury arising out of defective products and he has developed a niche practice in aviation-related claims. These include cases arising out of serious bodily injury following domestic or international aviation accidents, as well as fatal and serious injury claims arising out of light aircraft accidents. Recent work has included representing families in claims arising out of the Shoreham Air Disaster (and advising on generic issues relating to potential group litigation); representing dependents of relatives killed in the Germanwings disaster, in respect of which there were significant disputes as to applicable law, jurisdiction and quantification; and the High Court case of Labbadia, which clarifies the scope of the Court of Appeal's decision in Barclay v British Airways PLC [2008] EWCA Civ 1419.

As part of his cross-over health and safety/injury practice, Lionel has advised and represented a cohort of families in group litigation arising out of the Grenfell Fire; and regularly acts in group litigation arising out of defective medical products. He also acts on behalf of companies facing prosecution or civil claims due to alleged breaches of health & safety legislation on construction sites or in other work environments.

Lionel's regular practice extends to cases involving complex issues of causation arising from subtle brain injuries, the onset of rheumatological conditions and non-organic pain (including complex regional pain syndrome, FND, chronic pain, post-traumatic fibromyalgia and somatoform/somatic symptom disorders).

Notable Personal Injury cases

A (a minor) v B & WMA

High Court spinal cord injury claim. Lionel (instructed by Joseph Dodman and Patrick Maguire at HCC) is representing a teenage boy who has suffered a C5 incomplete SCI in an accident at school following a playfight in circumstances where there was inadequate supervision of the students, compounded by delayed treatment. Liability and quantum remain in dispute.

B v T

High Court spinal cord injury claim. Lionel Stride (instructed by Phillip Andrews at Scooters & Bikes Legal and led by James Arney KC) represented a young man who suffered a T3/T4 SCI in a motorcycling accident. A settlement in the region of £4.25 million net of liability and gross of interim payments and recoverable benefits was achieved that reflected a likely capital valuation of the claim in excess of £10 million on a full liability basis. Although quantum was disputed, the main issue between the parties centred on liability in circumstances where the Claimant was struck by a vehicle turning right after he rode onto hatchings to overtake a van turning left at a very sharp junction. The evidence supported the proposition that the Defendant had turned out very slowly and had needed to act in some way to allow the van space to move into the junction.

R (Re R Deceased) v A

High Court FAA claim. Lionel Stride (instructed by Adrian Cottam and Emma Yeomans of DAC Beachcroft) represented the Defendant in a complex case arising out of a pedestrian accident. The main issues related

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

to whether R, the partner of the Deceased, was a qualifying cohabitee given the recency of their relationship; and, if not, how their daughter's dependency should be calculated given R's high income. The case was pleaded at over £4million and settled for a low seven figure sum at a JSM after exchange of detailed position statements on the legal arguments. The settlement, later approved by Master Sullivan, reflected the significant risk that the claimant would lose the cohabitation argument and be left with a zero award.

PLP v CM

Lionel Stride (instructed by Tracey Benson of Slater & Gordon), represented a claimant who suffered a through-knee amputation in a motorcycle v pedestrian accident. A settlement of £3million net of liability, interim payments and recoverable benefits was achieved. This reflected a reasonable compromise on his likely retirement age (given his stated pre-accident intentions) on a disability basis, the extent of his immediate needs (less significant) and future care/holiday assistance (commercial vs gratuitous split) and the number and cost of the prosthetics, as well as near full recovery of his accommodation claim with limited credit for his wife's share of their joint property. This reflected the difficulty for the Defendant in contending that it was unreasonable for the Claimant to act rationally to protect his position against the risk of relationship breakdown.

Settlement over £3 million in amputation claim for 62-year-old construction director

Y v BPS

Lionel Stride (instructed by Rebecca Smith at Stewarts) represented the Claimant, a trainee parachutist, in a High Court spinal cord injury claim arising out of a parachuting accident. The Claimant, a foreign national, alleged that her training had been inadequate and, in particular, that the Defendant had failed to risk assess or adequately monitor whether her proficiency in English had been sufficient to understand the technical language on the course. She contended that she should never have been allowed to undertake the jump without retraining and relied upon the evidence of fellow students on the course; her poor responses to the written examination undertaken prior to the jump; and disclosure from the Defendant that it had been aware of problems relating to English proficiency for several years. Liability was fully denied, with the Defendant disputing the inadequacy of the training, or that the Claimant's understanding had been demonstrably insufficient to undertake the jump. The critical issue was the appropriate standard of care for a parachuting company and the extent to which this extended to assessing and monitoring a student's language proficiency. Both parties were relying on expert evidence as to the relevant guidelines and standard of care and the case would have set legal precedent, there being no similar reported case relating to parachuting schools. The matter was proceeding to a split liability trial in January 2025 but the parties managed to settle the claim at a mediation shortly before its commencement on confidential and mutually satisfactory terms.

A v L & LV

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

Lionel Stride (instructed by Tracey Benson and Mark Jackson of Slater & Gordon), represented a claimant who suffered a transtibial amputation after a motorcycle collision. A settlement of £4.81 million was achieved, reflecting the claimant's need for adapted accommodation, impressive pre-accident earnings, and his exceptional facility as a user of prosthetics.

CJ (a protected party) v L

Lionel (instructed by David Johnson at DAC Beachcroft) represented the Defendant in a complex High Court pedestrian brain and catastrophic injury case pleaded at circa £7 million. Primary liability and contributory negligence remained in dispute, with evidence from accident reconstruction and CCTV analysis experts obtained by both parties, in addition to medical and quantum experts. The case was further complicated by the fact that the Claimant had pre-existing cognitive difficulties. However, it was her case that she had suffered serious brain and physical injuries that had caused a catastrophic decline in independence, leading to quantitatively and qualitatively different care and accommodation needs (including transfer to a residential home permanently). The Defendant contended that, with further surgical treatment, her care needs would return to their previous baseline with no qualitative change and/or only modest increases; and that credit should in any event be given for the likely continued provision of local-authority care (the Claimant having always had some funded care). The case ultimately settled at a second JSM for £1.15 million, which sum was later approved by the Court taking into account the liability and quantum disputes, as well as the accepted likelihood of continued local authority funding. The case was a textbook example of how Reaney (Reaney v University Hospital of North Staffordshire NHS Trust [2015] EWCA Viv 1119), Crofton (Crofton v NHS Litigation Authority [2007] EWHC Civ 71) and Sowden (Sowden v Lodge [2004] 1 WLR 2129) arguments can be applied in practice with the right evidence.

G v MIB

Lionel Stride (instructed by Tracey Benson of Slater & Gordon), represented a claimant who suffered a spinal cord injury after collapsing in the road and being run over by an untraced driver. A settlement of £3.55 million was obtained in the teeth of a full denial of liability by the MIB. The case demonstrates the need carefully to scrutinise any adverse evidence obtained by the MIB as part of their investigation into a claim presented under the Untraced Drivers' Agreement, as well as the need to communicate (a) clear grounds of opposition to the MIB's proposed decision; and (b) the intention to appeal if a nil or an unreasonably low award is made. By presenting the Claimant's critique of the evidence robustly at the settlement meeting, the parties were able to find a fair compromise without the need for such an appeal.
Lionel Stride (instructed by Tracey Benson of Slater & Gordon), represented a claimant who suffered a spinal cord injury after collapsing in the road and being run over by an untraced driver. A settlement of £3.55 million was obtained in the teeth of a full denial of liability by the MIB. The case demonstrates the need carefully to scrutinise any adverse evidence obtained by the MIB as part of their investigation into a claim presented under the Untraced Drivers' Agreement, as well as the need to communicate (a) clear grounds of opposition to the MIB's proposed decision; and (b) the intention to appeal if a nil or an unreasonably low award is made. By presenting the Claimant's critique of the evidence robustly at the settlement meeting, the parties were able to find a compromise that resulted in a fair compromise without the need for such an appeal.

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

Read more here https://tgchambers.com/case/g-v-mib/

P v B

Lionel Stride (instructed by Kevin Coakley at Horwich Farrelly) represented the Defendant in an amputee case pleaded at £7.5 million. The main areas of dispute centred on the extent and cost of the care regime; single-level accommodation; future work capacity; failure to mitigate loss by returning to work; and the number and type of prosthetics required. Full settlement was agreed at a JSM against leading counsel in the net sum of £3 million. This recognised both the severe nature of the Claimant's injuries, tempered by his resourcefulness and more limited prosthetic and accommodation requirements after taking into account the existing adaptations to his property, as well as his work capacity in a sedentary job.

H v RGH Ltd

Lionel (instructed by Ken Brough at HJA) represented the Claimant in a High Court claim in which his client suffered a severe crush injury to his dominant hand caused by a grab hire driver employed to extract waste from a garden. The Claimant's hand was functionally useless and he had developed an associated chronic pain condition, leaving him unable to work. There were significant disputes as to contributory negligence, the extent of his residual disability, and his pre- and post-injury earning capacity. The positions narrowed at a JSM, allowing the parties to agree a settlement at around £1.5million shortly prior to trial.

R & Ors v EUI Ltd

Lionel (instructed by Tony McLoughlin at Horwich Farrelly) represented the Defendant in a High Court fatal accident case pleaded at £3.65 million. The parties were able to reach agreement at a JSM in the net sum of £1.63 million, including a 20% deduction for contributory negligence. The liability apportionment having previously been agreed, the main outstanding areas of dispute related to the claims for loss of financial dependency (assessment of the Deceased's and the Claimant's pre-accident earning capacity); and service dependency (the level of childcare support that the Deceased would reasonably have provided). Expert employment, accountancy and care/loss of service reports were obtained on both sides and the settlement figure reflected a compromise position based on their competing analysis. The JSM took place after the joint statements had been obtained, allowing each party to make an accurate assessment of litigation risk.

S v B & C

Lionel (instructed by Patrick Maguire and Amber Braybrooke of HCC Solicitors and led at the JSM by Simon Browne KC) represented a young claimant in a High Court spinal cord injury claim arising out of a high-speed collision in which his client had been rendered paraplegic.

The Claimant, who was 18 at the time of injury, was in a car being driven recklessly by an older friend, resulting in a crash in which the vehicle rolled multiple times. Primary liability was admitted but the insurers initially pursued contributory negligence arguments based on an alleged failure to wear a seatbelt (the Claimant having no recollection). This issue was conceded by the Defendants only once it became clear on the medical evidence that the violence and multi-directional forces involved would have made the injury

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

equally, if not more, severe even if a seatbelt had been worn.

The case involved interesting issues of principle, including the extent to which the care regime should extend to offering greater independence, freedom of choice and autonomy – by enabling the Claimant to have an assistant on call 24 hours/day – rather than merely meeting his basic care needs (as the Defendants contended); and whether the past costs of a personal injury trust should be recoverable as a form of financial assistance in circumstances where, despite retaining capacity, the Claimant would have no feasible method of managing his unallocated interim payments without such assistance (the case of Martin v Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust [2022] EWHC 532 (QB) having resolved the issue unfavourably to injured parties with capacity in respect of prospective trust costs only).

Settlement of £10 million was achieved at a JSM against leading counsel on 29 November 2022 after exchange of evidence and fully pleaded schedules on a without prejudice basis. The settlement figure was commensurate with the Claimant's contentions about the cost and quality of his current care needs, with the Claimant accepting a larger lump sum to invest rather than a VPPO.

M v K & E

Lionel (instructed by Tony McLoughlin at Horwich Farrelly) represented the Defendant in a complex and challenging High Court case involving a motorcyclist who sustained multiple lower limb injuries putting him at risk of amputation. The case was pleaded at close to £3million on a provisional damages' basis. The parties adopted a constructive approach, balancing the disputes as to prognosis, amputation risk and quantification with recognition of the serious nature of the injuries and the benefit to both sides of early resolution. Consequently, the parties were able to reach agreement at a JSM for damages on a provisional basis at a little over £1million.

B v R

Lionel (instructed by Rebecca Smith at Stewarts and closely assisted by James Arney QC in preparation for the mediation) represented the passenger (a qualified pilot) in a High Court claim arising out of a light aircraft accident, allegedly caused by the negligence of the pilot in command. The pilot undertook an orbit rather than a go-around at too low an altitude and speed, causing the aircraft to stall and crash. The Claimant, a successful businessman, suffered a spinal cord injury and is now a paraplegic. His claim included lifelong care, accommodation, a range of mobility scooters and wheelchairs, together with walking aids, and a significant claim for loss of profit and the capital value of his business (which he had to sell at an undervalue as part of a management buyout due to the need to take early retirement).
The Defendant's insurers denied liability, contending that the manoeuvre was not negligent and the pilot acted reasonably to avoid conflict with another aircraft; that the Claimant was equally culpable because he was effectively operating as a co-pilot or functioning member of the crew, assisting the pilot with any observations; and/or that he had consented to the risk of injury and/or the manoeuvre performed.
Quantum was also fiercely disputed, despite the severity of the injury, with focused challenge to the claim for loss of profit and capital value. The claim settled at circa £4 million (i.e., at or close to the indemnity limit on the insurance policy), the Claimant electing not to pursue the pilot for any additional sum.

S v H

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

Lionel Stride (instructed by Oliver Marsh of Lyons Davidson), represented a senior banker who suffered a mild Traumatic Brain Injury and Post-concussion Syndrome/Persistent Postural-Perceptual Dizziness following two separate accidents at work when her chairs had collapsed, causing her on the first occasion to strike her head violently against a hard surface when she fell.

Settlement of £1.5 million was ultimately achieved at a JSM against leading counsel on 19 January 2023. This figure was commensurate with the Claimant's contention that she would not, absent injury, have been made redundant but for her injuries; and that, despite any improvement, she would not now realistically return to paid employment, but with a compromise that accepted she was unlikely in any event to have worked full-time through to state pension age.

Vincent v Walker [2021] EWHC 536 (QB)

High Court split liability (remote) trial involving a seriously injured claimant. The judgment clarifies the scope of a driver's duty of care (in terms of the speed, adjustments and observations required) when driving on a 50mph road and approaching a toucan crossing.

K v M

Lionel represented the Claimant (instructed by Michael Hardacre at Slater & Gordon) in a High Court case that settled at a JSM for £1.6 million. The Claimant was involved in a high-speed collision that fatally injured his brother. He suffered multiple injuries, including compound splintered fracturing at the proximal end of the ulna bone (olecranon), with bone loss involving the articular surface of the ulna at the elbow; and displaced, comminuted fracturing at the shafts of the radius and ulna. The left elbow fracture had failed to unite, which meant that he would need complex surgery and, further in the future, an elbow replacement and revision procedures. It was eventually conceded that the Claimant could not return to his job as an air conditioning engineer but there remained significant dispute as to his pre- and post-injury earning capacity. The claim ultimately settled at a pre-trial JSM on 21 July 2020 on the basis that he would need life-long care and assistance; is now only likely to be capable of part-time minimum wage employment; and should be considered fully (i.e., at least 'averagely') disabled for the purpose of calculating his claim for loss of earning capacity using the disabled Reduction Factors in the Ogden 8 actuarial tables.

E v A (insurer) and S (gym, in administration)

Lionel represented the Claimant (instructed by Michael Hardacre at Slater & Gordon) in a High Court paraplegia case that settled at a JSM for £1.525 million. The Claimant was injured after stumbling and falling while using a squat rack in a 'Free Weights' gym, which resulted in a crush injury to his spine from the barbell that he had been lifting. There were no safety bars on the squat rack at the material time and it was the Claimant's case that he had not been told how or why to use them. It was therefore alleged that the gym had failed to warn him of the need to use the safety bars with an induction or warning signs and had failed to risk assess or provide health & safety training to its staff to enable an effective induction to take place. The Claimant relied in part on three Improvement Notices that had been issued to the gym after the accident for breaches of sections 2 and 3 of the HSWA 1974. Liability remained firmly in dispute: the

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

Defendant contended that the Claimant was an experienced user of the gym and that it had discharged its duty by, among other things, providing safety bars and informing the Claimant that he should ask if unsure of how to use any lifting equipment. Further, although the full value of the claim was significantly higher (pleaded provisionally at £11.2 million), there was a 'costs and damages' indemnity limit on the public liability insurance policy of £2 million that would have served as a maximum cap on the amount of any judgment, although, if successful at trial, it was the Claimant's intention to seek a non-party costs order (or suitable equivalent) against the insurer for payment of costs in excess of the indemnity limit under CPR 46.2 and section 51 of the Senior Courts Act 1981 on the basis that they were, in reality, defending the claim in their own interests (in accordance with the principles in T.G.A Chapman Ltd v Christopher [1998] 1 WLR 12 (CA) and Palmer v Palmer [2008] EWCA Civ 46). The insurer was also being pursued directly for a declaration of liability under section 2 of the Third Parties (Rights against Insurers) Act 2010.

Labbadia v Alitalia [2019] EWHC 2103 (Admin)

Successfully represented the Claimant in a High Court claim arising out of his fall whilst descending disembarkation steps at Milan Airport. The case focused primarily on the judicial interpretation of 'accident' under the Montreal Convention 1999, namely whether there had been 'an unusual, unexpected or untoward event, external to the Claimant, causing death or injury, on board an aircraft or in the course of embarkation or disembarkation'. Margaret Obi, sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge, found that, against the standard practices at the airport, the stairs had not been cleared of snow by the time the first passenger disembarked the aircraft, causing compacted snow to form on which the Claimant would ultimately slip. Though there was nothing inherently unusual about the adverse weather conditions, she accepted that the use of aircraft stairs without a canopy was 'a positive decision on the part of the airport personnel'; and that the decision 'involved a series of actions and omissions culminating in the aircraft stairs being aligned to the aircraft and the authority being given for the passengers to disembark'. This in combination constituted an 'event'. Accepting Lionel's argument, she also found that 'the event was unusual from the point of view of the Claimant … he had no reason to expect that the stairs would be slippery due to compacted snow. Therefore, the event was unexpected and unforeseen from his perspective'. There is no other case precisely on all fours with this judgment, which helps to clarify the scope of the Court of Appeal's decision in Barclay v British Airways PLC [2008] EWCA Civ 1419.

P & Ors v Germanwings Gmbh; and M & Ors v Germanwings Gmbh

Confidential settlements achieved in two separate High Court claims brought on behalf of dependents of two different families arising out of the Germanwings disaster. There were significant disputes as to jurisdiction, applicable law and quantification, all of which had to be resolved during the settlement negotiations. The terms of the agreements included non-disclosure provisions preventing publication of the nature of the settlement achieved.

Clinical Negligence

Lionel is the editor of the TGC Clinical Negligence Newsletter and has a varied High Court medical negligence practice that covers the full range of work in this field. He regularly represents both individuals and the NHS/private practices at JSMs and mediations, strongly supporting early engagement in ADR where

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

appropriate, whilst always working closely with his clients and legal team to make sure that the claim will be trial ready.

His recent case load has incorporated:

- Complex claims arising out of obstetric and gynaecological injuries, including birth injuries (such as cerebral palsy) and other cases resulting in maximum disability to the child, as well as tears and other obstetric injuries to the mother that have caused permanent damage due to mistreatment
- Diagnostic failures such as compartment syndrome and false aneurysms resulting in amputation, as well as the delayed or wrongful investigation or diagnosis of cancer
- Negligent treatment of post-surgical infections leading to kidney failure
- Negligent eye and laser surgery, as well as the failure to diagnose retinal detachment
- Failure to convey to hospital, as well as diagnostic and treatment failures following urgent admissions to hospital
- Surgical negligence (with particular expertise in cases in which there has been permanent colorectal injury)
- General practitioner negligence in failing to refer or diagnose conditions such as meningitis, sepsis, encephalitis and suspected pulmonary embolism (resulting in death)
- Negligent nursing care of vulnerable patients in hospital leading to severe self-harm, as well as negligent supervision of psychiatric inpatients resulting in suicide
- Failure correctly to advise of the risks of recommended surgery, or suitable alternative treatment (applying the Supreme Court's decision in Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board [2015] UKSC 11)
- Mismanagement of bandaging resulting in equinus injury
- Secondary victim claims arising out of witnessing the traumatic consequences of negligent treatment or misdiagnosis

Notable Clinical Negligence cases

T v NGH NHS Trust

Lionel Stride (instructed by Emma Doughty of Slater & Gordon), secured a high seven figure settlement in a claim arising out of the failure to diagnose and treat sepsis in time, leading to the death of the patient. The claim was brought on behalf of the dependants and estate of the Deceased. It was their case that, had the Defendant given him prophylactic antibiotics, or later identified and treated his condition with appropriate urgency, the Deceased would have made a full recovery and his death would have been avoided. Although initially in dispute, liability was eventually conceded in full by the Defendant on this basis. There then remained significant disputes as to quantification of the claims for financial and service dependency, including the income and career intentions of the Deceased; whether there should be departure from the standard dependency ratios; and how the lost childcare services should be evaluated. The parties were able to reach a settlement at a JSM that reflected the balance of evidence on those issues.

A v M NHS FT

Lionel Stride (instructed by Joanne Warren of Slater & Gordon), secured a £1.7 million settlement shortly prior to the scheduled trial in March 2025 for a claimant who suffered significant nerve damage and mobility issues arising from a four-compartment fasciotomy procedure. Liability, causation and quantum all remained in dispute. It was the Claimant's case that there had both been a negligent misdiagnosis of

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

compartment syndrome (such that the surgery was unnecessary) and that it was conducted negligently. Although the Defendant made no admission, contending that the diagnosis and surgery were both reasonable, the settlement reflected the strength of her case on liability, as well as the high prospects of recovering her claim for future care and accommodation. This followed concessions made by the Defendant's orthopaedic expert in response to the detailed agenda for joint discussion in which he was forced to concede that an MRI would have ruled out any possibility of compartment syndrome and that there was ample time for further investigation pre-surgery.

T v C

Lionel Stride (instructed by Heather Moore of Slater & Gordon), successfully represented a claimant who lost both kidneys as a result of the allegedly negligent failure to monitor nephrotoxic drugs by her GP. She required a kidney transplant and had suffered reduced life expectancy, with anticipated failure of the transplanted kidney within 15 years and the likelihood that she would spend the last 4 years of life on dialysis with 24/7 care needs. Liability, causation and quantum all remained in dispute. The Claimant contended that the Defendant was under a duty to monitor her kidney function and that, having undertaken a blood test, he failed to identify abnormalities in her levels of creatinine that should have led to repeat testing and early diagnosis of her condition, such that she would have avoided her later kidney failure. The Defendant disputed that he was required to monitor the Claimant's kidney function despite clear NHS guidelines to the contrary because she was being treated on a private basis by a rheumatologist, who had prescribed the nephrotoxic drugs. The main issue in the case therefore centred on the scope and extent of a GP's duty to undertake repeat blood testing in circumstances where a patient is already under the separate care of a private specialist. The matter was listed for trial in early 2025 but the parties reached a high six-figure settlement at ADR that reflected both the weight of the Claimant's evidence and her poor prognosis.

H v EKHU NHS FT

Lionel Stride (instructed by Emma Doughty and Joanne Warren of Slater & Gordon), represented a claimant who suffered severe injuries as a result of a negligent failure to diagnose cauda equina syndrome at A&E. Breach of duty, causation and quantum were all initially in dispute. The claim ultimately settled for a sum in excess of £1million at a JSM. The settlement was consistent with the Claimant succeeding on her primary case but with reductions for the risk that she might lose on one or more of the causation issues and/or that her award would be discounted to reflect her medical history and increased need for care in future in any event.

H v G & B-C

Lionel Stride (instructed by Louise Robson at City Lawyers) represented the Claimant in a High Court clinical negligence claim arising out of the delayed diagnosis of throat cancer, which led to severe ongoing disability due to the invasive treatment required. Breach of duty, causation and quantum all remained in dispute. Lionel was asked to take over the case and suggested critical amendments to the Particulars of Claim that were later permitted by the Court. The claim ultimately settled for in excess of £1million after exchange of joint statements. The settlement favoured the Claimant's evidence on breach of duty and causation, with a reduction to life expectancy due to comorbid conditions.

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

JT v ENH

Lionel Stride (instructed by Ben Gent at Slater & Gordon) represented the Claimant in a High Court clinical negligence claim arising out of negligent nursing care following an episode of encephalitis that resulted in a fall from a second-floor window. The Claimant suffered multiple injuries and was unable to resume a highly lucrative career in the City. Breach of Duty was eventually conceded, but there remained significant dispute about the quantification of her loss of earning capacity, care and accommodation needs. The parties remained over £2million apart at a failed mediation conducted in early 2023. Following joint statements and further exchange of argument, however, the Defendant significantly revised its position and accepted the Claimant's offer of settlement of £3.15 million a matter of weeks before trial.

ST v ENH

Lionel Stride (instructed by Louise Robson at City Lawyers) represented the Claimant in a seven figure High Court clinical negligence claim arising out of the failure to identify and treat a third/fourth degree tear following an episiotomy, leading to infection, development of a fistula, damage to her sphincter and delayed repair. She was left with ongoing bowel symptoms, including urgency, soiling, flatus incontinence and some impaired rectal evacuation. This restricted the Claimant to working from home, significantly reducing her earning capacity. The Defendant disputed quantum and causation on grounds that the tears could not have been repaired satisfactorily in any event. The parties could not reach agreement at an early JSM because of the stark difference in valuations, and assessment of risk, relating to the causation issue. Damages were later agreed at a substantially higher figure than that proposed by the Defendant at the settlement meeting after further exchange of evidence and argument.

W & Ors v I & C

Lionel Stride (instructed by Helen Osborne at Slater & Gordon) represented the Claimants in a tragic High Court clinical negligence claim arising out of the failure to diagnose a pulmonary embolism in her partner, leading to his tragic death. Breach of duty, causation and quantum remained in dispute, including whether the First Claimant qualified as a dependant by reason of the duration of her relationship with the Deceased. There was also an associated secondary victim claim that was due to be stayed pending the outcome of the conjoined appeals in the Supreme Court of Paul & Ors v The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust & Ors [2022] EWCA Civ 12. However, the parties managed to reach agreement on all issues at a JSM in early 2023, with the minor dependency claims later being approved by the Court. The compromise on the secondary victim claim reflected the potential change in the law once the conjoined appeals have concluded.

L v WHH, HC & PS (HC, 7 February 2023, unreported); Mediation April 2023

Lionel Stride successfully persuaded the Judge to allow late amendments to the pleaded case (allowing a new 'consent' argument to be run) that reflected the developed evidence of the Claimant's medical experts less than 3 months prior to trial in a complex High Court clinical negligence claim arising out of the failure adequately to bandage ulcered legs, leading to delayed recovery, prolonged immobility, foot drop and profound ongoing disability. In a case pleaded at circa £5million with the claimant having suffered

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

permanent disability, the Judge found that, despite inevitable consequences for the trial timetable, the overwhelming prejudice to the Claimant justified permitting the amendments. This ultimately persuaded the Defendants to agree to a mediation and the parties were able to reach an agreed settlement of the claim shortly prior to the commencement of the trial on liability.

T v GST FT

Lionel Stride (instructed by Emma Doughty at Slater & Gordon) represented the Claimant in a High Court Montgomery consent case arising out of the alleged failure to offer reasonable alternative treatment in the form of carotid stenting rather than a carotid endarterectomy ("CE") in circumstances where he had already suffered a partial hypoglossal injury from an earlier procedure. Consequently, during the second CE operation, the Claimant suffered a bilateral hypoglossal injury that caused complete tongue paralysis, loss of speech and inability to swallow, immediate cardiac arrest (caused by his paralysed tongue blocking his airways and leading to hypoxia), the need for a tracheostomy, laryngoscopy and the insertion of a PEG feeding tube. The injury left him unable to communicate verbally, permanently fatigued and with associated respiratory issues. He had retired prematurely and was living a far more isolated life due to his difficulty communicating.

The Defendant denied liability, contending that CS was not a reasonable alternative treatment because it carried a much higher stroke risk; was not offered by or available to practitioners at the treating hospital; and transferring the Claimant to another hospital would have caused life-threatening delay. Causation and quantum also remained heavily in dispute.

The claim ultimately settled at a JSM for £800,000 a month before trial. Although no formal concessions were made, the settlement sum reflected the Claimant's evidence that he should have been treated as a non-standard case given his original hypoglossal injury; that he would have chosen CS if offered, thereby avoiding any risk of a second hypoglossal injury; and that his consequential injuries had caused permanent disability that would have resulted in him being awarded a high proportion of his pleaded case at trial.

A v UHDB NHS Foundation Trust

High Court clinical negligence case. Lionel (instructed by Mathew Smith of Linder Myers) represented a man who had suffered an amputation of his right leg resulting from an alleged failure to diagnose vascular issues (aorta-iliac arterial disease) between 2010 and 2016. This ultimately led to an above-knee amputation as opposed to the angioplasty that would have saved his leg. Breach of duty, causation and quantum (including life expectancy) remained in dispute. Claims for future loss included accommodation (Swift calculation), professional care, prosthetics and home adaptations. The claim settled at close to £1 million, which took into account reduced life expectancy from pre-morbid conditions but with no material discount for litigation risk on the issues of breach of duty or causation.

S (on behalf of her estate and dependants) v RFL NHS Trust

High Court clinical negligence case. Lionel (instructed by Laura Cleevely at Slater & Gordon) represented the family of a patient who died following a negligent failure to diagnose a facial lesion as Squamous Cell Carcinoma despite vulnerability from pre-existing lupus. This led to a 12-month delay in diagnosis that

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

proved fatal. Breach of duty, causation and quantum (including life expectancy) remained in dispute. The claim settled for a high six-figure sum at an all-day mediation that assumed a favourable result for the Claimant at trial on all issues in dispute.

H v L NHS Foundation Trust

High Court clinical negligence case. Lionel (instructed by Mathew Smith of Slater & Gordon) represented a man who had been misdiagnosed with metastatic cancer rather than transient inflammatory disease, leading to intensive pharmacological treatment that caused permanent physical harm and psychological damage. Breach of duty, causation and quantum (including life expectancy for an unrelated condition) remained in dispute. The claim settled for a high six-figure sum at an all-day mediation that assumed a favourable result for the Claimant on all issues.

W v ESH NHS Trust

High Court clinical negligence case. Lionel (instructed by Iona Smith and James Roberts at Gaby Hardwicke) represented an elderly lady who lost a leg as a result of an alleged failure to diagnose a pseudoaneurysm following re-hospitalisation after an angiogram, leading to severe infection and ultimately amputation. Breach of duty, causation and quantum remained in dispute. The Defendant contended that the pseudoaneurysm had developed rapidly and/or been identified at the earliest reasonable opportunity. The parties could not reach agreement at a full-day mediation but the claim settled shortly thereafter for a confidential six-figure sum when the Defendant significantly increased its previous offer. The settlement reflected the Claimant's age and an appropriate discount for litigation risk to both sides.

L v BH NHS Trust

High Court claim in which Lionel (instructed by Joanne Warren at Slater & Gordon) acted on behalf of an elderly claimant who lost a limb as a result of negligent treatment following cardiac arrest. Breach of duty and causation were admitted but there remained significant dispute as to life expectancy, care and equipment needs and use of prosthetics. A high six-figure settlement was achieved at a remote mediation during the Lockdown. The contributing parties and amount of the settlement remain confidential.

B v NW Anglia NHS Foundation Trust

Representing the dependents of a deceased patient in a High Court claim arising out of an 18-20 month negligent delay in diagnosing cancer, which resulted in the patient's premature death. The claim, which included significant claims for past and future loss of financial dependency, as well as grandparental childcare services, settled for £860,000 at a JSM.

D v NHS CB & R

Successfully defended a claim brought against an ophthalmologist who was alleged to have failed to identify

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

a posterior retinal detachment at two separate examinations, leading to sudden deterioration in vision, emergency surgery and permanent visual defects. Breach of duty, causation and quantum remained in dispute. Evidence was heard from five different experts at trial. HHJ Walden-Smith, sitting as a High Court Judge, found that the Second Defendant had not acted in breach of duty in respect of the first examination (there having already been a limited admission of breach of duty by the First Defendant in respect of the second examination) and that, in any event, the retinal detachment had occurred rapidly after both examinations.

Product Liability

Lionel has extensive experience bringing and defending claims for injury arising out of defective products. This includes a seven-figure claim against multiple defendants arising out of a defective light aircraft (built privately using a kit and parts supplied by different companies) and cases involving the failure of prosthetics, as well as medical/surgical equipment, which have led to serious injury.

These cases frequently involve cross-over expertise (i.e., product liability, personal injury and/or clinical negligence) because there is the potential for multiple causes of action and defendants. This in turn has led to associated work arising out of negligent installation of fire doors, insulation and cladding on large blocks of flats (subsequent to the Grenfell Fire) as well as property damage arising out of faulty equipment.

Notable Product Liability cases

S v J & J

High Court claim in which Lionel (instructed by Ken Brough at HJA) represented the claimant in a case arising out of injury sustained following the misfiring of a medical stapler during surgery, causing serious injury. It was alleged that the stapler was defective, being part of group of similar products subject to a product recall that had significantly higher rates of misfire. The claim settled for a confidential sum following exchange of evidence.

T v C & Ors

High Court claim in which Lionel (instructed by Rebecca Smith and Julie Straughan at Irwin Mitchell) acted on behalf of the dependants of a pilot and his wife, who tragically died in light aircraft crash in 2015. The primary claim (pleaded at over £4 million) was brought against the constructor, kit and engine providers and Light Aircraft Association in negligence and/or under the CPA. The secondary claim adopted the defences of the primary defendants and was brought in negligence on behalf of the dependents of the wife against the estate of the pilot. Breach of duty, causation and quantum all remained in dispute, complicated by expert aviation, engineering and metallurgical evidence from the Defendants challenging the conclusions of an AAIB investigation. Settlement was achieved after a 13-hour mediation. The contributing parties and amount of the settlement remain confidential.

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

Motor Insurance Fraud

Acting predominantly for insurers, Lionel's practice in this area is now almost exclusively focused on personal injury and clinical negligence claims of significant pleaded value where there has been surveillance or other evidence supporting allegations of serious exaggeration and fundamental dishonesty. His approach recognises the gravity of such allegations and the need for forensic and objective analysis to ensure that they are not made lightly, or without a firm evidential basis.

Excluding ongoing cases of obvious sensitivity, examples of concluded cases involving findings of fraud or fundamental dishonesty (of claimants or solicitors) include:

Notable Motor Insurance Fraud cases

D v L

Dishonesty involving a firm of solicitors. During the course of litigation, the Defendant obtained evidence from a handwriting expert demonstrating that signatures on key documents that had required re-service with appropriate interpretation certificates had not been penned by the Claimant. At trial, the Judge found that the signatures were likely to have been forged by the Claimant's solicitors. The claim was struck out as an abuse of process; and the Judge made a show cause order against the Claimant's solicitors for payment of the Defendant's full costs; and ordered that a transcript of the judgment be sent to the Solicitors' Regulation Authority and the police.

G v BCC

An exaggerated personal injury claim pleaded at close to seven figures, including loss of earnings claimed at over £400,000. The claimant had advanced a claim for serious injury and disability arising from an alleged accident at work. He claimed to have been unable to return to any form of employment since 2011 as a result of his injuries but the defendant identified documentary evidence that he had in fact worked in his old capacity throughout this time. On application, the claim was struck out as an abuse of process prior to trial (applying Summers v Fairclough Homes Ltd [2012] UKSC 26). The Claimant was later convicted of fraud by false representation.

O v UHD NHS Foundation Trust

An exaggerated clinical negligence claim. Although breach of duty and causation of infertility due to delayed diagnosis of ovarian cancer had been conceded, the Claimant sought £4million in damages on the premise that she had developed a disabling chronic pain condition that precluded her from working. The Defendant later obtained surveillance, disclosed after service of updated witness statements, showing that she was capable of living a considerably more active life than claimed. The Court granted permission to rely upon this evidence in a contested application and the Defendant also amended the Defence to plead exaggeration/fundamental dishonesty. The claim was later struck out with enforceable costs orders against the Claimant, together with an order for repayment of six-figure interim payments.

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

Insurance

In addition to his main practice areas, Lionel regularly advises on insurance-related issues in a wide range of contexts (contracts, coverage and indemnity, incorporating discrete issues such as material non-disclosure, fraudulent misrepresentation, wrongful repudiation, declarations, waivers and the meaning and effect of warranties and conditions). These issues frequently arise in his aviation practice but his expertise also extends to motor, life, personal and public liability insurance contracts.

Non-exhaustive examples of recent advisory work include:

- Advising on conditions precedent and exclusion clauses in aviation contracts where the insurers have reserved, withdrawn or threatened to withdraw indemnity
- Advising on insurance coverage in the context of passengers and crew members in aviation contracts
- Advising insurers on material non-disclosure in the context of motor insurance contracts
- Advising insurers on the right to repudiate personal and public liability contracts for material non-disclosure or by invoking the 'fraud' clause (such as in cases of suspected arson)
- Advising on the terms and conditions in life insurance policies where indemnity has been wrongfully repudiated

Professional Negligence

Lionel regularly accepts instructions in professional negligence claims against solicitors and barristers, particularly those arising out of negligent advice and omissions that have led to significant under-settlement of claims (for example, failing to investigate or consider the effect of rheumatological or other chronic pain conditions such as fibromyalgia) and to negligent conduct that has resulted in abandonment or non-pursuit of claims. His professional liability expertise extends to claims arising out of construction and breach of contract disputes, particularly where there are associated health & safety issues (for example, advising councils on claims relating to the negligent installation, and maintenance, of cladding and fire doors).

Costs & Litigation Funding

Lionel undertakes costs work in all areas of commercial and common law litigation, with a particular focus on cases arising out of his main practice areas in the fields of personal injury, clinical negligence and group litigation. He has extensive expertise in costs management conferences, including applications to dispense with, or retain, costs budgeting in cases valued over £10 million or with considerable complexity, detailed assessments, costs appeals, enforceability challenges to CFAS (under the old rules), solicitor-own client assessments and drafting general points of dispute. He can also advise on costs budgeting, compliance and the application of, and exceptions to, QOCS (including cases where there are historical pre- and post- April 2013 funding arrangements in place). This extends to mixed cases where there are both injury and non-injury claims.

Health & Safety

Lionel has cross-over expertise in the field of health & safety, including representing families at inquests

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

following hospital and workplace deaths and representing duty-holders in prosecutions under the HSWA 1974 following both fatal and non-fatal accidents in the workplace. Lionel advises on health and safety issues in related contexts (for example, advising councils on claims relating to the negligent installation, and maintenance, of cladding and fire doors). He also attends inquests on behalf of claimants and defendants who may bring or face civil claims arising out of health and safety failings (for example, on construction and building sites).

Collective Redress

Lionel accepts instructions in substantial group litigation across a wide variety of areas. Recent work has included: –

• Involvement in group litigation arising out industrial deafness in a large factory (confidential settlements achieved);

• Representing families in claims arising out of the Shoreham Air Disaster (and advising on generic issues relating to potential group litigation);

• Representing dependents of relatives killed in the Germanwings disaster, in respect of which there were significant disputes as to applicable law, jurisdiction and quantification.

• Advising and representing a cohort of families in group litigation arising out of the Grenfell Fire, including the quantification and assessment of multiple claims within that litigation for the purpose of apportionment between competing categories of claimants to ensure fair compensation for each selected cohort.

• Leading a team of barristers at TGC assisting Pogust Goodhead to value nearly 100 individual product liability claims in a group action against a leading pharmaceutical company (Johnson & Johnson) arising out of the insertion of Transvaginal Mesh in cases of stress urinary incontinence.

• Leading a team of barristers at TGC assisting Pogust Goodhead to plead Schedules of Information for over 170 claimants pursuing product liability claims in a group action against a leading pharmaceutical company (Bayer) arising out of the use of their Essure Device for 'non-surgical' sterilisation.

Awards

- Shelford Scholarship, (Lincoln's Inn, 2005)
- Runner-up, Taylor Prize, (Nottingham Law School, 2005)
- Tancred Studentship, (Lincoln's Inn, 2004)
- Hardwicke Entrance Award, (Lincoln's Inn, 2004)
- Professor Morris Prize, (Aston University, 2003)

Education

- BVC (Very Competent – 2nd in order of merit), Nottingham Law School

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

- GDL (Distinction), College of Law
- BSc (First Class Honours – 1st in order of merit), Aston University

Languages

- French (fluent)
- Spanish (fluent)

Memberships

- PNBA
- PIBA
- HSLA
- APIL
- CORLA

Recommendations

- **Chambers & Partners 2026 (ranked for Personal Injury (Band 1) and Clinical Negligence)**
- *"A highly intellectual barrister, Lionel leaves no stone unturned. His advocacy skills are incredible and he thinks on his feet in a magnificent way."*
- *"Lionel Stride is a powerhouse junior. His attention to detail is second to none, and he prides himself on delivering an exceptional service, every time, whether on paper or on his feet."*
- *"Lionel is a master of detail and is the go-to barrister in any case involving complex medical histories and the need for no stone to be unturned. He will fight tooth and nail for clients."*
- *"Lionel is a forceful barrister who is very good on his feet in court."*
- *"He is completely ahead of the evidence from the word go."*
- *"He gets a really clear, crystalised case from the early stages, he has great attention to detail and he is thorough."*
- *"He is a very safe and trusted pair of hands in any case he works on."*
- *"He is very forensic, he is uber-prepared…."*
- **Legal 500 2026 (ranked in Tier 2 for both Clinical Negligence and Personal Injury)**
- "An excellent barrister with fantastic analytical skills."
- "Lionel is incredibly forensic. He has an amazing ability to get to the nub of a case, drilling down very early on so that there are no surprises."
- **Chambers and Partners 2025 ranked for Personal Injury and Clinical Negligence**
- "He is a tenacious negotiator and ruthless advocate." "Lionel's attention to detail is exemplary. No stone is left unturned and his advice to clients, in terms of evidence and quantum, is always clear so clients understand their position and options. " "The level of detail he deals in is incredible. He is really thorough and really forensic." "He has a superb eye for detail and takes thoroughness to a whole new level in complex cases, always spotting the weaknesses in a case and pre-empting them." "He is exceptionally hard-working, formidable and persuasive."

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

- **Legal 500 2025 ranked in Tier 2 for both Clinical Negligence and Personal Injury**
- "Lionel has a great depth of knowledge of catastrophic personal injury claims. He is extremely personable and approachable and has a fantastic attention to detail." "He has a good manner with clients and is very thorough and efficient"
- **Chambers & Partners 2024 ranked for Personal Injury**
- "He is very persuasive, whether on his feet or on paper, and able to think outside the box." "He is a great strategist on difficult and complex matters, offering very sound and clear advice." "His advocacy skills are exceptional both in terms of court appearances and in terms of settlement discussions and mediation."
- **Legal 500 2024 ranked in Tiers 1-3 for Clinical Negligence, Personal Injury, Industrial Disease and Insurance Fraud**
- "Lionel's attention to detail is second-to-none and his thorough pleadings are the best in the business."
- **Chambers & Partners 2023 ranked for Personal Injury**
- "The effort he puts in and the application of his obvious cerebral ability makes Lionel a pleasure to instruct." "[He] has an innate ability to get straight to the heart of the matter and to make the complex appear straightforward." "Lionel has a thorough analytic approach to complex cases."
- **Legal 500 2023 ranked in Tiers 1-3 for Clinical Negligence, Personal Injury, Industrial Disease and Insurance Fraud**
- "Lionel's attention-to-detail in the preparation of documents is exceptional." "[He] is an excellent advocate who elegantly puts forward his client's case and can quickly adapt to changing circumstances on his feet."
- **Chambers & Partners 2022 ranked for Personal Injury**
- "He has phenomenal attention to detail and is masterful with clients." "He is very calm and measured, and not easily flustered." "He is a really effective courtroom advocate who is always very well prepared and legally very strong."
- **Legal 500 2022 ranked in Tiers 1-3 for Clinical Negligence, Personal Injury, Industrial Disease and Insurance Fraud**
- "Lionel is extremely thorough with a keen eye for detail. He is excellent in conference with both clients and experts, and is a skilled negotiator." "[He] is extremely knowledgeable, meticulous and a firm negotiator."
- **Chambers & Partners 2021 ranked for Personal Injury**
- "He is extremely thorough and takes a forensic approach to evidence." "He is really technical and very good at providing clear advice and courses of action."
- **Legal 500 2021 ranked for Clinical Negligence, Personal Injury, Industrial Disease and Insurance Fraud**
- "Very thorough and swiftly cuts through the case to identify the key issues. A practitioner whom clients instantly like and trust." "A formidable advocate who takes no prisoners and is detailed yet concise on paper."
- **Chambers & Partners 2020 ranked for Personal Injury**
- "He is a persuasive advocate who takes no prisoners in court or at JSMs." "He has a keen eye for detail and finds solutions rather than problems."
- **Legal 500 2020 ranked for Clinical Negligence, Personal Injury, Industrial Disease and Insurance Fraud**
- "A very persuasive advocate who has a forensic approach to the evidence." "Very thorough in conferences with experts."
- **Legal 500 2019 ranked for Personal Injury and Insurance Fraud**
- "He is a modern lawyer in every respect and brings real value to every case." "He is a passionate

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com

lawyer, who gets under the skin of a case."

- **Legal 500 2017 ranked for Personal Injury and Insurance Fraud**
- "A tenacious advocate, who is up to date with the latest developments in the area." "Thorough with papers, pragmatic with his advice and a compelling advocate."

London Office:
1 Harcourt Buildings
Temple
London EC4Y 9DA

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com
DX: 382 London Chancery Lane

The Hague Office:
Lange Voorhout 82
2514 EJ The Hague
Netherlands

T: +44 (0)20 7583 1315
E: clerks@tgchambers.com