

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Foreword by Lord Woolf</i>	vii
<i>Preface</i>	ix
<b>A. THE NATURE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW: <i>keys to understanding what the Court is doing</i></b>	<b>3</b>
<b>P1 A constitutional guarantee. Judicial review is the rule of law in action: a fundamental and inalienable constitutional protection.</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Constitutional supervision of public authorities	5
1.2 Judicial review and the rule of law	7
1.3 Judicial review's constitutional inalienability	12
<b>P2 Supervisory jurisdiction. Judicial review is a well-established supervisory role by the Court over public bodies.</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 A supervisory jurisdiction	15
2.2 Importance and range of subject-matter	17
2.3 Judicial review in other Courts and Tribunals	18
2.4 The Administrative Court in action: some special features	19
2.5 Procedural discipline and firm case-management	26
2.6 Basic steps in a judicial review case	27
<b>P3 Impact. A successful claim does not necessarily guarantee a favourable ultimate outcome, nor a wider knock-on effect.</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1 Remittal and repeatability	29
3.2 Hollow/counterproductive victories	32
3.3 Judicial review as a monetary springboard	33
3.4 Securing assurances/provoking comment	33
3.5 Wider impact/knock-on effect	35
<b>P4 Materiality. A claim may fail if lacking substance, as where non-material, non-prejudicial, futile, academic or premature.</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1 Practical substance and judicial review	37
4.2 Materiality/material flaw	39
4.3 Lack of prejudice	41
4.4 Futility	43
4.5 Dangers of materiality, prejudice and futility	44
4.6 Hypothetical/academic issues: utility	47
4.7 Prematurity	52
<b>P5 Targets. A wide range of measures, acts, decisions, policies and omissions can be the subject of a judicial review challenge.</b>	<b>56</b>
5.1 Judicial review and "decisions"	56
5.2 Spectrum of possible targets	58
5.3 Multiple targets/target-selection	61

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>P6</b>	<b>Power sources. Public bodies' powers and duties can arise under or by reference to EU and domestic legislation, common law or prerogative, policy guidance or international law.</b>	<b>64</b>
6.1	Powers/duties: basic sources	64
6.2	Policy guidance	67
6.3	International law	73
<b>P7</b>	<b>Constitutional fundamentals. Core common law principles can constitute fundamentals of the UK's unwritten constitution.</b>	<b>82</b>
7.1	Legislative supremacy	82
7.2	Rule of law/separation of powers	86
7.3	Access to justice	86
7.4	Constitutional/common law rights/duties	88
7.5	Basic fairness/natural justice	95
7.6	Basic reasonableness	97
<b>P8</b>	<b>EU law. Domestic statutes, rules and decisions must be compatible with applicable EU legislation and legal principle.</b>	<b>99</b>
8.1	EU law supremacy	99
8.2	EU Treaty rights	100
8.3	Judicial review for EU-incompatibility	101
8.4	Reference to the CJEU	102
8.5	EU law damages/reparation	103
8.6	EU Charter of Fundamental Rights	103
<b>P9</b>	<b>The HRA. Domestic legislation must be read, and public authorities must act, compatibly with HRA:ECtHR rights.</b>	<b>105</b>
9.1	HRA: key features and themes	105
9.2	Codified Convention rights	109
9.3	HRA s.2: relationship with Strasbourg	110
9.4	HRA s.3: compatible interpretation	113
9.5	HRA s.6: compatible public authority action	116
9.6	HRA just satisfaction	118
<b>P10</b>	<b>Cooperation &amp; candour. The Court will expect from all parties cooperative behaviour and candid disclosure.</b>	<b>120</b>
10.1	A cooperative enterprise	120
10.2	ADR/mediation	122
10.3	Claimant's duty of candour	124
10.4	Defendant/interested party's duty of candour	125
<b>P11</b>	<b>Precedent &amp; authority. Judicial precedent can bind or guide the court; academic and comparative analysis may be persuasive.</b>	<b>129</b>
11.1	Use of case-law	129
11.2	Academic commentary/comparative case-law	135

<b>P12</b>	<b>Reviewing primary legislation. Courts have restricted functions of assessing legal compatibility of Acts of Parliament.</b>	<b>138</b>
12.1	Primary legislation: disapplication under EU law	138
12.2	HRA s.4: declaration of incompatibility	138
12.3	Judicial review of primary legislation at common law	141
<b>P13</b>	<b>Restraint. Courts adopt a primary self-restraint, preserving for public bodies a latitude for judgment and discretion.</b>	<b>143</b>
13.1	“Soft” review: reasonableness	143
13.2	Restraint and factual questions	145
13.3	Restraint and discretion/judgment	147
13.4	Restraint and expertise	148
13.5	Judicial restraint in action	149
13.6	Protecting public authorities	153
13.7	Review from the decision-maker’s point of view	153
<b>P14</b>	<b>Balancing. Judicial review principles are a careful evolving equilibrium serving the dual imperatives of vigilance and restraint.</b>	<b>155</b>
14.1	Judicial review and striking a balance	155
14.2	Striking a balance: grounds for judicial review	156
14.3	Striking a balance: nothing personal	157
14.4	Convenience and floodgates	158
<b>P15</b>	<b>The forbidden method. Judges will not intervene as if matters for the public body’s judgment were for the Court’s judgment.</b>	<b>161</b>
15.1	“Soft” review: the forbidden substitutionary approach	161
15.2	“Not an appeal”	162
15.3	“Legality not correctness”	164
15.4	“Not the merits”	164
15.5	“Court does not substitute its own judgment”	166
<b>P16</b>	<b>Hard-edged questions. There are certain matters which the Court considers afresh for itself, imposing its own judgment.</b>	<b>167</b>
16.1	Hard-edged review: correctness	167
16.2	Precedent fact	167
16.3	Error of law as hard-edged review	168
16.4	Interpretation as a hard-edged question	169
16.5	Procedural fairness as hard-edged review	171
16.6	Hard-edged review: further matters	172
<b>P17</b>	<b>Evidence and fact. Judicial review is generally conducted on written evidence and regarded as an unsuitable forum for resolving factual disputes, though this can be appropriate and necessary.</b>	<b>175</b>
17.1	Judicial review evidence	175
17.2	Fresh evidence in judicial review	179
17.3	Judicial review and factual disputes	184
17.4	Disclosure, further information and cross-examination	190

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>P18 Costs. Generally, the loser must pay the winner's costs</b>	<b>197</b>
18.1 Costs: general matters	197
18.2 Costs and the permission stage	206
18.3 Costs and the public interest	208
18.4 Costs and discontinuance/early disposal	210
18.5 Special costs responses	212
<b>P19 Making the claim. Where pre-claim correspondence fails, claims are to be made and acknowledged in the prescribed way.</b>	<b>214</b>
19.1 Pre-claim steps	214
19.2 Making the claim	215
19.3 Acknowledging the claim	217
<b>P20 Interim remedies. The Court can make orders securing a particular state of affairs pending final resolution of the claim.</b>	<b>220</b>
20.1 Interim remedies	220
20.2 The balance of convenience	225
<b>P21 Permission. The claimant must obtain permission for judicial review, by prompt and candid papers disclosing an arguable case.</b>	<b>228</b>
21.1 Granting or refusing permission	228
21.2 Case-management at the permission stage	234
<b>P22 Substantive hearing. At the hearing the Court decides whether there are grounds for intervening and whether to grant a remedy.</b>	<b>240</b>
22.1 Post-permission/pre-hearing steps	240
22.2 Third party participation	244
22.3 Disposal without a hearing	250
22.4 The substantive hearing	251
<b>P23 Appeal. An appeal lies from the Administrative Court's decisions (except the grant of permission).</b>	<b>257</b>
23.1 Permission-stage appeals	257
23.2 Substantive appeals	260
23.3 Nature of the Court of Appeal's approach	263
<b>P24 Remedies. The Court has discretionary power to quash, mandate, prevent and clarify.</b>	<b>266</b>
24.1 The remedial toolkit	266
24.2 The declaration	266
24.3 Remedy as a discretionary matter	271
24.4 The remedies in action	274
<b>P25 Monetary remedies. Judicial review embraces damages, debt and restitution, HRA "just satisfaction" and EU reparation; but a broader financial response to maladministration awaits development.</b>	<b>282</b>
25.1 Availability of debt, restitution and damages	282
25.2 Recognised species of monetary claim	284

25.3	Public law reparation: no damages for maladministration	288
<b>B.</b>	<b>PARAMETERS OF JUDICIAL REVIEW:</b> <i>further dominant themes shaping the law and practice</i>	<b>293</b>
<b>P26</b>	<b>Delay. Claims must be prompt (3 months in an EU case); undue delay can be fatal to permission or (if prejudicial) a remedy.</b>	<b>295</b>
26.1	The approach to delay	295
26.2	Promptness and the running of time	300
26.3	Good reason to extend time	304
26.4	Hardship, prejudice and detriment	310
<b>P27</b>	<b>Public/private. Judicial review is the (normally non-exclusive) application of “public law” principles to “public” functions.</b>	<b>313</b>
27.1	The public/private distinction	313
27.2	Public law principles outside CPR 54	314
27.3	Procedural exclusivity/abuse of process	316
<b>P28</b>	<b>Ouster. Head-on statutory exclusion of judicial review is theoretically possible but constitutionally dubious.</b>	<b>320</b>
28.1	Ousting judicial review: a hostile climate	320
28.2	Time-limit ousters	322
<b>P29</b>	<b>Interpretation. Discerning the true meaning of legislative and other relevant sources is vital to effective judicial review.</b>	<b>324</b>
29.1	The purposive approach to interpretation	324
29.2	Legislative purpose and judicial review	326
29.3	Statutory interpretation	327
29.4	Using Hansard	335
29.5	Interpreting other sources	340
<b>P30</b>	<b>Function. It is essential to understand the role and responsibilities of the decision-maker under review.</b>	<b>345</b>
30.1	Understanding the defendant’s function	345
30.2	Traditional functional labels	346
30.3	The judicial/administrative distinction	347
30.4	Other aspects of function	348
<b>P31</b>	<b>Context. Context being everything, the Court will always respond to the nature and circumstances of the individual case.</b>	<b>351</b>
31.1	Contextualism	351
31.2	Circumstances	353
31.3	Characteristics and conduct of the claimant	354
31.4	Claimant’s failure to complain/raise the concern at the time	356
31.5	“Flexi-principles”	359

<b>P32 Modified review. Matters may involve part-availability of judicial review; or restricted or enhanced grounds.</b>	<b>362</b>
32.1 Part-reviewability of Crown Courts	362
32.2 Judicial review of decisions regarding legal process	364
32.3 Anxious scrutiny	368
32.4 Other modified review situations	371
<b>P33 Flux. Judicial review is dynamic: new faiths emerge, old ones decay; the general trend being towards empowering the Court.</b>	<b>376</b>
33.1 The developing law	376
33.2 Lessons from the past	379
33.3 “Two-stage” approaches to legal development	381
33.4 Next steps in public law: forecasting	383
<b>P34 Reviewability/non-reviewability. Judicial review applies to the exercise of “public” functions, with few forbidden areas.</b>	<b>385</b>
34.1 Surveying the field	385
34.2 Principles of reviewability	387
34.3 Conquests of reviewability	391
34.4 Special functions and immunity from review	393
34.5 Private law matters	397
<b>P35 Principle of legality. Public power may not be exercised to abrogate fundamental common law values, at least unless abrogation is required or empowered by clear primary legislation.</b>	<b>402</b>
35.1 The principle of legality	402
35.2 Protected values under the principle of legality	404
35.3 International law and the principle of legality	406
35.4 The principle of legality and statutorily-endorsed abrogation	408
<b>P36 Alternative remedy. Judicial review is a last resort and generally inappropriate where suitable alternative safeguards exist.</b>	<b>411</b>
36.1 General effect of other safeguards	411
36.2 Exclusive alternative remedy	412
36.3 Alternative remedy and discretion/case-management	413
36.4 Whether action/avenue curative of public law wrong	422
<b>P37 Proportionality template. Proportionality requires State-proven appropriateness and necessity to achieve a legitimate aim.</b>	<b>427</b>
37.1 Proportionality analysis	427
<b>P38 Standing. The claimant must have a sufficient interest in the subject-matter, and be a victim if relying directly on the HRA.</b>	<b>432</b>
38.1 The requirement of sufficient interest	432
38.2 The approach to sufficient interest	433
38.3 Standing at the permission/substantive stages	439
38.4 Standing under the HRA: the victim test	441

<b>P39 Discretion/duty. Judicial review supervises discretionary powers entrusted to, and duties imposed on, public bodies.</b>	<b>443</b>
39.1 No unfettered powers	443
39.2 Discretion/power: the essential duties	444
39.3 Discretion and duty in action	448
<b>P40 Inalienability. Public bodies' basic powers and duties are to be respected, preserved and not compromised.</b>	<b>453</b>
40.1 Preservation of powers and duties	453
40.2 Inalienability and estoppel/legitimate expectation	455
<b>P41 Legitimate expectation. Promises or practices may raise expectations incapable of unfair or unreasonable dishonour.</b>	<b>459</b>
41.1 The role of legitimate expectation	459
41.2 Basic anatomy of a legitimate expectation	464
<b>P42 Onus. It is for the judicial review claimant to establish grounds for intervention, but on many issues the public body bears the onus.</b>	<b>471</b>
42.1 Onus generally on the claimant	471
42.2 Onus on the defendant	472
<b>P43 Severance. A measure may be partially upheld if, shorn of vitiated parts, the substantial purpose and effect remain intact.</b>	<b>476</b>
43.1 Severability	476
<b>P44 Nullity. In principle, any material public law wrong will vitiate the impugned act of the public body so that it is a "nullity".</b>	<b>479</b>
44.1 Invalidity labels	479
44.2 Flaws constituting "nullity"	480
44.3 Purpose/effect of "nullity"	481
<b>C. GROUNDS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW:</b>	
<i>public law wrongs justifying the Court's intervention</i>	<b>485</b>
<b>P45 Classifying grounds. Inapt for rigid categorisation, grounds fit broadly within unlawfulness, unreasonableness and unfairness.</b>	<b>487</b>
45.1 The conventional threefold division	487
45.2 Root concepts and unifying themes	489
45.3 Reviewing discretion: <i>Wednesbury</i> and abuse of power	490
45.4 Overlapping grounds and interchangeable labels	492
<b>P46 Ultra vires. A body must not exceed received powers or breach duties, from higher authority, as properly interpreted.</b>	<b>495</b>
46.1 Basic meanings of ultra vires	495
46.2 Interpretation securing validity: reading down/reading in	497

<b>P47 Jurisdictional error. A body must understand the scope and limits of its jurisdiction.</b>	<b>499</b>
47.1 Jurisdiction/jurisdictional error as a flexi-principle	499
47.2 Jurisdictional error as hard-edged review (correctness)	501
47.3 Error of law and jurisdictional error	502
<b>P48 Error of law. A body must not make a material error of law.</b>	<b>504</b>
48.1 Error of law/misdirection in law	504
48.2 Error of law: restricted categories?	506
<b>P49 Error of fact. A body must not make errors of precedent fact, fundamental factual errors or findings unsupported by evidence.</b>	<b>508</b>
49.1 Precedent/objective fact	508
49.2 Fundamental/material error of fact	509
<b>P50 Abdication/fetter. A body must not surrender its function, as by: (a) acting under dictation; (b) improperly delegating its powers; or (c) operating an inflexible policy.</b>	<b>517</b>
50.1 Basic duty not to abdicate/fetter	517
50.2 Acting under dictation	518
50.3 Improper delegation	519
50.4 Fetter by inflexible policy	522
<b>P51 Insufficient inquiry. A body must sufficiently acquaint itself with relevant information, fairly presented and properly addressed.</b>	<b>526</b>
51.1 Duty of sufficient inquiry	526
51.2 Whether material fairly presented/properly addressed	528
<b>P52 Bad faith/improper motive. A body must not act in bad faith or have an improper object or purpose.</b>	<b>530</b>
52.1 Bad faith	530
52.2 Improper motive	531
<b>P53 Frustrating the legislative purpose. A body must act so as to promote the purpose for which the power was conferred.</b>	<b>534</b>
53.1 Duty to promote the legislative purpose	534
<b>P54 Substantive unfairness. A body must not act conspicuously unfairly, nor so unfairly as to abuse its power, nor in unjustified breach of a legitimate expectation.</b>	<b>537</b>
54.1 Substantive unfairness	537
54.2 Unjustified breach of a substantive legitimate expectation	543
<b>P55 Inconsistency. A body should ensure equal treatment, certainty of approach and no legally relevant unjustified departures.</b>	<b>546</b>
55.1 Equal treatment, non-arbitrariness and certainty	546
55.2 Unjustified departure	552
55.3 Statutory equality duties	555



<b>P56 Relevancy/irrelevancy. A body must have regard to all, but to only, legally relevant considerations.</b>	<b>558</b>
56.1 The relevancy/irrelevancy principle	558
56.2 Obligatory and discretionary relevance	563
56.3 Relevance and weight	565
<b>P57 Unreasonableness. A body must not act unreasonably.</b>	<b>569</b>
57.1 The unreasonableness principle	569
57.2 High threshold epithets	570
57.3 Species of unreasonableness	572
57.4 Unreasonableness in action	573
<b>P58 Proportionality. Certain contexts require a body's response to be appropriate and necessary to achieve a legitimate aim.</b>	<b>577</b>
58.1 Proportionality	577
58.2 Proportionality as part of reasonableness	577
58.3 Common law proportionality	579
58.4 Proportionality and scrutiny of evidence/reasoning	583
58.5 Latitude and intensity of review	585
<b>P59 HRA-violation. A body must not act incompatibly with Convention rights protected by the HRA.</b>	<b>591</b>
59.1 Testing for an HRA-violation	591
59.2 Article 2: life	592
59.3 Article 3: cruelty	594
59.4 Article 5: liberty	595
59.5 Article 6: fair-hearing	597
59.6 Article 8: private and family life	604
59.7 Article 10: expression	607
59.8 Article 14: non-discrimination	609
59.9 Article 1P: property-interference	612
59.1 0 Further Convention rights and provisions	613
<b>P60 Procedural unfairness. A body must adopt a fair procedure, giving those affected a fair and informed say.</b>	<b>618</b>
60.1 The basic concept of fairness	618
60.2 Procedural fairness as a flexi-principle	625
60.3 Procedural fairness: supplementing the legislative scheme	627
60.4 Procedural ultra vires	630
60.5 The basic right to be heard	632
60.6 Adequate consultation	636
60.7 The basic right to be informed	640
60.8 Other rights of procedural fairness	647
<b>P61 Bias. A body must not have a direct interest in the outcome of a decision, or show actual bias or a real possibility of bias.</b>	<b>652</b>
61.1 Automatic disqualification	652
61.2 Actual bias	653
61.3 Apparent bias	654

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>P62 Reasons. Public Bodies are often required to give reasons, and always required to make the reasons they do give adequate.</b>	<b>658</b>
62.1 Importance of reasons	658
62.2 Judicial review for failure to give reasons	661
62.3 Adequacy of reasons	666
62.4 Timing of reasons	671
62.5 Remedy for lack/insufficiency of reasons	675
<b>P63 External wrongs. Judicial review may occasionally lie against a blameless body, for a third party wrong or external injustice.</b>	<b>678</b>
63.1 External wrongs	678
<b>D. MATERIALS:</b> <i>key sources of rules and procedure</i>	<b>681</b>
<b>64.1 Senior Courts Act 1981, ss.31&amp; 31A</b>	<b>683</b>
<b>64.2 Civil Procedure Rules Part 54</b>	<b>685</b>
<b>64.3 CPR Part 54 Practice Directions 54A &amp; 54D</b>	<b>689</b>
<b>64.4 Administrative Court Office Notes for Guidance</b>	<b>696</b>
<b>64.5 Judicial Review Pre-Action Protocol</b>	<b>707</b>
<b>64.6 Judicial Review Urgent Cases Procedure</b>	<b>713</b>
<b>64.7 Human Rights Act 1998</b>	<b>715</b>
<b>64.8 Form N461</b>	<b>734</b>
<b>64.9 Form N462</b>	<b>740</b>
<b>64.1 Form N463</b>	<b>744</b>
<b>64.1 List of articles</b>	<b>746</b>
<i>Table of Cases</i>	749
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	829
<i>Table of Statutory Instruments</i>	831
<i>Index</i>	835