



Legal Update for Care Providers – Changes to DOLS: The end of Cheshire West

Isabel De La Haye
9 July 2026 at WSPIC/SfC Managers Forum



What We Will Cover

- Explain the 2026 Supreme Court changes
- Clarify the impact on Cheshire West
- Set out practical steps for care home providers
- Highlight some of the legal risk and compliance considerations

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



1

2

Where Did This All Start?

- This change in the law came about because of:
 - *A Reference by the Attorney General for Northern Ireland of a devolution issue under paragraph 34 of Schedule 10 to the Northern Ireland Act 1998 [2026] UKSC 16*
 - Sometimes referred to as AGNI

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



3

Reminder: Deprivation of Liberty

- For the purposes of Article 5 ECHR, a person is deprived of their liberty if three elements are satisfied:
 - The **objective element**: the person is confined to a particular restricted space for more than a negligible period of time
 - The **subjective element**: there is no valid consent to that confinement
 - The **state is responsible** for the confinement (basically the state is aware of it)

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



4

Reminder: Cheshire West (2014)

- Acid test: The **objective element** is satisfied where a person is under continuous supervision + not free to leave
- This test was applied regardless of compliance and did not focus on the subjective element
- Led to significant increase in DoLS applications

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



5



Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



6

What Has Changed in 2026?

- Supreme Court has moved away from the acid test
- Cheshire West approach no longer correct on its own
- Now requires a multifactorial, case-specific assessment
- Borderline cases – where there is serious doubt, no inference of valid consent should be drawn

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



7

Don't Panic !

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



8

The New Legal Test

- No single deciding factor
- Must consider the person's specific situation
- Focus on overall impact of restrictions rather than a checklist

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



9

Key Factors to Consider:

1) The Objective Test: Is it confinement?

- Type of restrictions (locks, supervision, restraint, medication?)
- Duration and intensity
- Effect of the restriction on the individual
- Purpose (care vs control?)
- Whether the person objects
- Relative normality of the situation
- The extent of isolation and availability of social contacts
- In borderline cases (think of the sliding scale – a prison cell being the most restrictive end of the sliding scale)

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



10

Major Shift: Consent

2) If it is confinement – does the person give consent?

- A person may consent even if lacking capacity under MCA
- Wishes and feelings carry significant legal weight
- Compliance doesn't mean automatic consent, but it is now relevant and you must consider

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



11

Objection is Now Central

- Objection strongly indicates a deprivation of liberty
- Includes behaviour, distress, refusal of care
- Need to evidence whether a resident is objecting or content

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



12

Impact on Social Care Providers

- Fewer situations will now meet the deprivation threshold
- Need for professional judgment, not a tick-box approach
- Greater emphasis on recording rationale and decision-making

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldridge.com



13

DoLS in Practice Now

- DoLS still applies where deprivation exists
- Borderline cases should still be referred
- Continue to seek authorisation where uncertainty exists

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldridge.com



14

Existing Authorisations

- Some residents may no longer require DoLS
- Providers should support reviews with local authorities
- Authorisations remain lawful until reviewed

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldridge.com



15

Legal Risks for Providers

- Risk of unlawful deprivation if under-identifying cases
- Risk of over-restrictive care practices
- Increased scrutiny on documentation and decision-making

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldridge.com



16

Required Actions for Providers

- Update internal policies and procedures
- Train staff on new multifactorial approach
- Review current residents with restrictions
- Strengthen recording of wishes, feelings and behaviours

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



17

Updates Awaited

- Updated guidance from DHSC will be published
- Current update – interim guidance – can be found here:
 - [UK Supreme Court 2026 judgment on what constitutes a deprivation of liberty - GOV.UK](#)

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



18

Good Practice Example

- Assess: Is the resident content?
- Record behaviour and engagement
- Consider if restrictions are proportionate
- Document reasoning clearly

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



19

Scenario 1: Content Resident

- Resident has 24/7 supervision and locked doors – they don't have capacity to make a decision about where they live and they do have a diagnosis of dementia
- HOWEVER, they appear happy, engages with staff, does not try to leave
- Question: Is this still a deprivation of liberty?
- Key point: Consider consent, wishes, and lack of objection

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



20

Scenario 2: Clear Objection

- Resident repeatedly tries to leave
- Becomes distressed and resists care
- Staff use 1:1 supervision and occasional restraint
- Key point: Strong indication of deprivation of liberty – DoLS likely required

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



21

Scenario 3: Fluctuating Presentation

- Resident sometimes appears content but at other times tries to leave
- Occasionally refuses care
- Key point: Fluctuating objection – refer and document carefully
- Likely requires authorisation due to uncertainty

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



22

Scenario 4: Family Disagreement

- Resident appears settled
- Family says resident would not want to be in care home
- No active objection from resident
- Key point: Focus on resident's current wishes and feelings
- Family views relevant but not determinative

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



23

Scenario 5: Restrictions Due to Condition

- Resident has severe physical frailty
- Unable to leave independently
- Minimal active restrictions by staff
- Key point: May not amount to deprivation of liberty if limits arise from condition

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



24

Key Learning from Scenarios

- No automatic answers under new law
- Focus on objection, consent, and lived experience
- Always document reasoning
- When in doubt – seek legal/DoLS advice

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



25

Top 10 Mistakes Post-2026 Judgment

1. Still relying on acid test alone
2. Ignoring consent
3. Failing to record wishes
4. Assuming compliance = no deprivation
5. Not recognising objection
6. Poor documentation
7. Not reviewing existing DoLS
8. Over-restrictive care plans
9. Not training staff
10. Failing to refer borderline cases

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



26

CQC-Ready Recording (Examples)

- Record clearly:
 - 'Resident appears content and expresses wish to remain'
 - 'No attempts to leave observed'
 - 'Restrictions proportionate to risk'
 - 'Regular reviews undertaken'
- [CQC statement on the Supreme Court's judgment on deprivation of liberty – Care Quality Commission](#)

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



27

Key Takeaways

- Acid test no longer sufficient
- Consent and objection now matter
- Holistic assessment required
- Legal and documentation standards have increased

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldrIDGE.com



28

Support from Us

- Legal advice on complex cases
- Policy and training support
- Assistance with Court of Protection or DoLS challenges
- Contact us for tailored guidance

Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldridge.com



29

Questions?



Email: info@LA-law.com

www.lesteraldridge.com



30



Visit: www.lesteraldridge.com for more information

Contact Isabel De La Haye

Isabel.DeLaHaye@LA-Law.com

01202 786191

The webinars delivered by Lester Aldridge LLP are provided for information purposes only and they are general in nature. They do not constitute legal or other professional advice and should not be relied upon as such. No responsibility for the accuracy and/or correctness of the information, or for any consequences of relying on it, is assumed or accepted by any member Lester Aldridge LLP or as Lester Aldridge as a whole. The content does not negate the requirement for comprehensive assessment of each specific circumstances. If you have any questions relating to this disclaimer or if you require legal advice, please contact info@LA-law.com.

31