

parents. At the time of the burial he had intended that his remains would be interred in the same grave in the fullness of time. In the two years following the burial of the deceased, the cremated remains of two further family members were interred in the grave. The petitioner became concerned that there would not be space in the grave for his remains to be buried with his wife. His wife was one of seven siblings and if they and their spouses all sought to be buried in the family grave there would need to be ten further interments in the grave. The petitioner wished for his wife's remains to be exhumed now for burial elsewhere in order that he could be sure of his remains being buried with her when the time came. All contactable family members consented to the proposal. The chancellor considered the decision of the Court of Arches in *Re Blagdon Cemetery* [2002] Fam 299 and held that the present case did not amount to exceptional circumstances such as to allow for a departure from the norm of permanence. Although there had been no delay in this case, it could not be said that there had been a relevant mistake. Further, the application sought to remove remains from a family grave, which demonstrated the very opposite of family unity. The application was refused. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X12000993

Re Bourne Abbey Churchyard

Lincoln Consistory Court: Bishop Ch, 19 June 2012

Exhumation – family grave

The chancellor granted a petition for the exhumation of the cremated remains of the petitioners' father for their re-interment with those of their mother in Essex. The whole family focus had been in Essex and the petitioners' parents had only moved to Bourne a relatively short time before their respective deaths. There was no question of mistake in relation to the burial, although the creation of a family grave was held to be adequate reason for a departure from the norm of permanence. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X12001007

Re St Michael and All Angels, Chell

Lichfield Consistory Court: Eyre Ch, 21 June 2012

Faculty jurisdiction – extension of time

The petitioners applied for an extension of time to complete works authorised under an unopposed faculty that was granted in February 2007 for the