

Palgrave Law Masters

# Constitutional and Administrative Law

*Company Law* Janet Dine and Marios Koutsias  
*Constitutional and Administrative Law* John Alder and Keith Syrett  
*Contract Law* Ewan McKendrick  
*Criminal Law* Jonathan Herring  
*Employment Law* Deborah J Lockton  
*Evidence* Raymond Emson  
*Family Law* Paula Davies and Paven Basuita  
*Intellectual Property Law* Tina Hart, Linda Fazzani and Simon Clark  
*Land Law* Mark Davys  
*Landlord and Tenant Law* Margaret Wilkie, Peter Luxton, Jill Morgan and Godfrey Cole  
*Legal Method* Ian McLeod  
*Legal Theory* Ian McLeod  
*Medical Law* Jo Samanta and Ash Samanta  
*Sports Law* Mark James  
*Torts* Alastair Mullis, Ken Oliphant and Sandy Steel  
*Trusts Law* Charlie Webb and Tim Akkouch

If you would like to comment on this book, or on the series generally, please write to [lawfeedback@palgrave.com](mailto:lawfeedback@palgrave.com).

Palgrave Law Masters

# Constitutional and Administrative Law

John Alder

Emeritus Professor of Law, Newcastle University

Keith Syrett

Professor of Public Health Law, Cardiff University

Eleventh edition



palgrave

© John Alder 1989, 1994, 1999, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013 and 2015

© John Alder and Keith Syrett 2017

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

Crown Copyright material is licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their right to be identified as the authors of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

This edition first published 2017 by  
PALGRAVE

Palgrave in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of 4 Crinan Street, London, N1 9XW.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978–1–137–60671–6 paperback

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

# Contents

<i>Preface</i>	xvi
<i>Table of cases</i>	xviii
<i>Table of legislation</i>	xxxviii

<b>Part I</b>	<b>The framework of the constitution</b>	<b>1</b>
1	Introduction: constitutional structures	3
1.1	The nature of the constitution: general issues	3
1.1.1	Constitutionalism	6
1.2	The foundations of a constitution	6
1.3	Basic constitutional concepts	6
1.4	Written and unwritten constitutions: advantages and disadvantages	8
1.4.1	The merits of a written constitution	8
1.5	The legal and the political constitution	13
1.6	The dignified and efficient constitution: deceiving the people?	15
1.7	Types of constitution	16
1.8	Public and private law	20
1.9	The direction of the constitution: reform	21
	Summary	23
	Exercises	23
	Further reading	24
2	Underlying political traditions	26
2.1	Introduction	26
2.2	Liberalism	26
2.3	Varieties of liberalism in constitutional thought	28
2.3.1	Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679): the impersonal state and individualism	28
2.3.2	John Locke (1632–1704): individual rights and majority government	31
2.3.3	Utilitarianism: David Hume (1711–76), Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), John Stuart Mill (1806–73)	32
2.3.4	Market liberalism (neo-liberalism): Friedrich Hayek (1899–1992)	33
2.3.5	Welfare liberalism: John Rawls (1921–2000): liberal justice and equality	35
2.3.6	Liberal pluralism: group liberalism	36
2.4	Freedom	37
2.5	Republicanism	40
2.6	Equality	44
2.7	Communitarianism	45
2.8	Democracy	45
2.8.1	Legal aspects of democracy	47
2.8.2	Representative democracy	48

2.8.3	Participatory democracy	49
2.8.4	Political parties: market democracy	51
	Summary	52
	Exercises	53
	Further reading	54
3	The sources of the constitution	55
3.1	Introduction	55
3.2	Statute law	55
3.3	The common law	57
3.4	Constitutional conventions	59
3.4.1	The nature of conventions	60
3.4.2	The main conventions	61
3.4.3	Identifying conventions	62
3.4.4	The differences between law and convention: conventions and the courts	63
3.4.5	Why conventions are obeyed	66
3.4.6	Codification of conventions	66
	Summary	68
	Exercises	68
	Further reading	69
4	Historical landmarks	70
4.1	Introduction	70
4.2	The Saxon period: origins of the Crown	71
4.3	The medieval period: the beginning of parliamentary government and the common law; the formation of national identity	71
4.4	The sixteenth century, the Tudor period: the consolidation of the government	74
4.5	The seventeenth-century revolution: the supremacy of Parliament over the Crown	76
4.5.1	The 'glorious'/'bloodless' revolution of 1688: the foundation of the modern constitution	79
4.6	The eighteenth century: the parliamentary system and the rule of law	80
4.6.1	The courts and the rule of law	84
4.7	The nineteenth century: reforms and democracy	85
4.8	The twentieth century: the rise of the executive	88
4.9	The present century: distrust, reforms and an uncertain future	90
	Summary	92
	Exercises	93
	Further reading	93
5	An overview of the main institutions of the constitution	94
5.1	The basic structure of the constitution	94
5.1.1	The state	95
5.2	The legislative branch	96
5.2.1	Political parties	97
5.3	The executive branch	97
5.4	The judicial branch	99
5.4.1	The Supreme Court	100
5.4.2	Other courts	102
5.4.3	Judicial diversity	103

5.5	Local government in England	104
5.6	The police and the prosecution system in England and Wales	106
5.7	The Privy Council	108
5.8	The Church of England	109
5.9	Government standards of behaviour	110
5.10	Constitutional reform	113
	Summary	114
	Exercises	115
	Further reading	116

## **Part II** Fundamental principles **119**

6	The rule of law	121
6.1	The nature of the rule of law	121
6.2	Practical application of the rule of law	123
6.3	Different versions of the rule of law	124
6.4	The core rule of law and Dicey's version of it	126
	6.4.1 The core rule of law and freedom	127
	6.4.2 Dicey's version of the rule of law	128
	6.4.3 Dicey's rule of law today	131
6.5	The 'amplified' rule of law	132
6.6	The extended (liberal) rule of law: 'the principle of legality'	133
6.7	The international rule of law	135
	Summary	135
	Exercises	136
	Further reading	137
7	The separation of powers	138
7.1	Introduction: Montesquieu's doctrine of the separation of powers	138
7.2	The importance of the separation of powers in the UK	139
7.3	Different kinds of separation of powers	140
	7.3.1 The mixed constitution	141
7.4	Judicial independence and accountability	142
	7.4.1 Accountability	144
7.5	Separation of function	145
	7.5.1 Parliament and the executive	145
	7.5.2 Parliament and the judiciary	146
	7.5.3 The executive and the judiciary	147
7.6	Separation of personnel	150
	7.6.1 Parliament and the executive	150
	7.6.2 Parliament and the judiciary	151
	7.6.3 The executive and the judiciary	151
7.7	Checks and balances	153
	7.7.1 Parliament and the executive	154
	7.7.2 Parliament and the judiciary	154
	7.7.3 The executive and the judiciary	156
	Summary	160
	Exercises	161
	Further reading	162

8	Parliamentary sovereignty	163
8.1	Introduction	163
8.2	The basis of parliamentary sovereignty	164
8.3	The meaning of 'Act of Parliament'	166
8.4	The three facets of parliamentary sovereignty	167
	8.4.1 Freedom to make any kind of law	167
	8.4.2 Parliament cannot be overridden	168
	8.4.3 Parliament cannot bind its successors	168
8.5	Challenging parliamentary sovereignty	169
	8.5.1 Grants of independence	169
	8.5.2 Scotland and Northern Ireland: Acts of Union – was Parliament born unfree?	170
	8.5.3 Redefinition theory: entrenchment	171
	8.5.4 European Union law	174
	8.5.5 The Human Rights Act 1998	177
	8.5.6 The common law/rule of law	177
	Summary	180
	Exercises	181
	Further reading	182

## Part III International aspects of the constitution 185

9	The state and the outside world	187
9.1	Introduction: the idea of the state	187
9.2	The UK as a state	188
9.3	Citizenship	189
	9.3.1 Removal of citizenship and statelessness	192
	9.3.2 Non-citizens	192
9.4	British dependent territories	194
	9.4.1 The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man	194
	9.4.2 British overseas territories	195
9.5	International law and domestic law	199
	9.5.1 Customary law	199
	9.5.2 General principle of law	200
	9.5.3 Treaties	201
	9.5.4 Applying treaties in the courts: incorporated treaties	203
	9.5.5 Applying treaties in the courts: unincorporated treaties	203
9.6	Overseas relationships and the courts	205
	9.6.1 State immunity	205
	9.6.2 Diplomatic immunity	207
	9.6.3 Act of state and justiciability	208
	9.6.4 International jurisdiction	212
9.7	Removal from the UK	213
	9.7.1 Deportation and expulsion	213
	9.7.2 Asylum	214
	9.7.3 Extradition	215
	9.7.4 Human rights restrictions on removal	217



Summary	219
Exercises	220
Further reading	222
10 The European Union	223
10.1 Introduction: the nature of the European Union	223
10.2 Institutions	226
10.2.1 The Council of Ministers	227
10.2.2 The European Council	228
10.2.3 The European Commission	228
10.2.4 The European Parliament	230
10.2.5 The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)	231
10.3 EU law and national law	234
10.3.1 Direct effect of EU law	235
10.3.2 Direct applicability and direct effect	235
10.3.3 Indirect effect: interpretation of EU law	236
10.3.4 State liability	237
10.3.5 Effective remedies	237
10.3.6 Fundamental rights	238
10.4 Democracy and the European Union	239
10.4.1 Treaty alterations	240
10.4.2 Access to information	241
10.5 Proportionality and subsidiarity	242
10.6 Leaving the EU: Brexit	243
10.6.1 The referendum	243
10.6.2 Triggering the leaving process	245
10.6.3 The negotiations	247
10.6.4 Alternative arrangements	249
10.6.5 Scotland and Northern Ireland	250
10.6.6 The mechanics of changing domestic law	251
Summary	252
Exercises	253
Further reading	254

## Part IV Government institutions 255

11 Parliament: constitutional position	257
11.1 Introduction	257
11.2 The meeting of Parliament	259
11.3 The House of Lords	262
11.3.1 The functions of the House of Lords	263
11.4 The Parliament Acts	265
11.5 The functions of the House of Commons	266
11.6 Parliamentary privilege	267
11.6.1 Contempt of Parliament	268
11.6.2 'Exclusive cognisance'	269
11.6.3 Freedom of speech	272

11.6.4	Qualified privilege	276
11.6.5	Publication of parliamentary proceedings	276
11.6.6	The courts and Parliament	277
11.6.7	Reform of parliamentary privilege	278
11.7	Standards in the Commons	278
11.7.1	The Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards	280
11.7.2	The Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority	280
11.7.3	Standards in the House of Lords	282
	Summary	282
	Exercises	283
	Further reading	284
12	The composition of Parliament and parliamentary elections	286
12.1	Introduction	286
12.2	The House of Lords	286
12.3	Reform of the House of Lords	289
12.4	Membership of the House of Commons	292
12.5	The electoral system	294
12.5.1	The purpose of elections	294
12.5.2	The Electoral Commission	295
12.5.3	General elections and by-elections	296
12.5.4	Candidates	297
12.5.5	Eligibility to vote	297
12.5.6	The voting system	300
12.5.7	Other voting systems	301
12.5.8	The constituencies	302
12.5.9	Voting procedures	304
12.6	Election campaigns	304
12.6.1	Campaign expenses	304
12.6.2	Donations to political parties	306
12.6.3	Broadcasting and the press: freedom of expression	307
12.6.4	Election disputes	309
	Summary	309
	Exercises	310
	Further reading	311
13	Parliamentary procedure	312
13.1	Introduction	312
13.2	The Speaker of the Commons	314
13.3	Legislative procedure	315
13.3.1	Public bills	315
13.3.2	Private bills	317
13.3.3	Government control over procedure: cutting short debate	319
13.4	Financial procedure	319
13.4.1	Taxation procedure	320
13.4.2	Supply procedure	321
13.5	Supervision of the executive	322
13.5.1	Questions to ministers	322
13.5.2	Debates	323

---

13.5.3	Select Committees	324
13.5.4	Supervising expenditure	326
13.5.5	Scrutiny of delegated/subordinate legislation	328
13.6	Redress of grievances	329
13.7	House of Lords procedure	330
	Summary	331
	Exercises	332
	Further reading	332
14	The Crown	334
14.1	Introduction: the nature of the Crown	334
14.2	Succession to the monarchy	337
14.3	Financing the monarchy	338
14.4	The functions of the monarch	338
14.4.1	Personal powers of the monarch	339
14.5	Crown immunities	340
14.6	The royal prerogative	341
14.6.1	The scope of modern prerogative powers	342
14.6.2	Two kinds of prerogative power?	343
14.6.3	Political control over the prerogative	344
14.6.4	Judicial control	345
14.6.5	Prerogative and statute	347
14.6.6	Reform of the prerogative	349
	Summary	349
	Exercises	350
	Further reading	351
15	Ministers and departments	352
15.1	Introduction	352
15.2	Appointment of the prime minister	353
15.3	The powers of the prime minister	354
15.4	The Cabinet	355
15.5	Ministers	356
15.6	Government departments	357
15.6.1	The Treasury	358
15.6.2	The law officers	360
15.7	Ministerial responsibility	361
15.7.1	Collective responsibility	362
15.7.2	Individual responsibility	364
15.7.3	Ministerial resignation	367
15.8	The civil service	368
15.8.1	The statutory framework	369
15.8.2	Recruitment	370
15.8.3	Legal status	371
15.8.4	Discipline	371
15.8.5	Civil servants and ministerial responsibility	372
15.9	Executive agencies and non-ministerial government departments	373
15.9.1	Executive agencies and non-ministerial departments and ministerial responsibility	374
15.10	Non-departmental public bodies: 'quangos'	375

Summary	379
Exercises	380
Further reading	381
16 Devolution	382
16.1 The background to devolution in the UK	382
16.2 The structure of devolution	384
16.2.1 Legal limits on the devolved lawmakers	386
16.3 Scotland	388
16.3.1 The Scottish Parliament	388
16.3.2 The Scottish Government	392
16.3.3 The courts	393
16.3.4 Devolution issues (s 98, Sched. 6)	394
16.4 Northern Ireland	395
16.5 Wales	398
16.5.1 The National Assembly for Wales	398
16.5.2 The Welsh Government	400
16.5.3 The courts	400
16.6 England	401
Summary	402
Exercises	402
Further reading	403

**Administrative law****405**

17 The grounds of judicial review, I: illegality and ultra vires	407
17.1 Introduction: the constitutional basis of judicial review	407
17.2 The legal basis of judicial review	408
17.2.1 Appeal and review	409
17.3 Classification of the grounds of review	410
17.4 Illegality: 'narrow' ultra vires	411
17.5 Errors of law and fact	412
17.5.1 Error of law	413
17.5.2 Errors of fact	414
17.6 'Wide' ultra vires: improper purposes and relevance	415
17.6.1 Improper purpose	416
17.6.2 Irrelevant considerations	416
17.6.3 Failure to take relevant factors into account: fettering discretion	420
17.7 Nullity: void and voidable decisions	422
Summary	424
Exercises	425
Further reading	426
18 The grounds of judicial review, II: beyond ultra vires	427
18.1 Irrationality/unreasonableness	427
18.1.1 Proportionality	430
18.2 Procedural impropriety: statutory procedural requirements	431
18.3 Procedural impropriety: the right to a fair hearing	434
18.3.1 Legitimate expectations	437

18.4	Procedural impropriety: bias	442
18.5	Procedural impropriety: reasons for decisions	446
18.6	The European Convention on Human Rights	448
	Summary	449
	Exercises	449
	Further reading	451
19	Judicial review remedies and procedure	452
19.1	Introduction	452
19.2	The range of remedies	454
19.2.1	<i>Habeas corpus</i>	455
19.3	The judicial review procedure: public interest safeguards	456
19.4	Standing ( <i>locus standi</i> )	460
19.4.1	The costs of judicial review	461
19.5	Choice of procedure: public and private law	462
19.6	Exclusivity	464
19.7	The exclusion and limitation of judicial review	466
19.7.1	Justiciability and 'deference'	466
19.7.2	Statutory exclusion of judicial review	470
	Summary	471
	Exercises	472
	Further reading	473
20	Administrative justice	474
20.1	Tribunals	474
20.1.1	First Tier Tribunals and the Upper Tribunal	475
20.1.2	The independence of tribunals	476
20.2	Ombudsmen	477
20.3	Inquiries	479
20.4	Regulators	482
	Summary	486
	Exercises	487
	Further reading	487

## Part VI Fundamental rights 489

21	Human rights and civil liberties	491
21.1	Introduction: the nature of human rights	491
21.2	The common law	493
21.3	The European Convention on Human Rights	495
21.3.1	The margin of appreciation	497
21.3.2	Positive duties	497
21.4	The main Convention rights	498
21.4.1	Absolute rights with no exceptions	499
21.4.2	Conditional rights	505
21.4.3	The duty to investigate violations	509
21.4.4	Rights subject to being overridden (qualified rights)	510
21.4.5	Article 14: discrimination	518
21.5	Criticisms of the Strasbourg court	520

Summary	521
Exercises	522
Further reading	523
22 The Human Rights Act 1998	525
22.1 The scope of the Act	525
22.2 Relations with the Strasbourg court	527
22.3 Extraterritorial application	529
22.4 Time limits	532
22.5 The HRA and Parliament	534
22.5.1 The interpretative obligation	535
22.5.2 Declaration of incompatibility	537
22.5.3 Statement of compatibility	538
22.6 Remedies	538
22.6.1 Damages	540
22.7 Public authorities	540
22.8 Horizontal effect	542
22.9 Overriding protected rights	543
22.9.1 'Prescribed by law' or 'in accordance with the law'	544
22.9.2 Necessary in a democratic society: proportionality	547
22.9.3 The margin of appreciation/discretion	550
22.10 Reforms	557
Summary	559
Exercises	560
Further reading	562
23 Freedoms of expression and assembly	564
23.1 Introduction: justifications for freedom of expression	564
23.1.1 Prior restraint	566
23.2 The legal basis of freedom of expression	567
23.3 Limits on freedom of expression	568
23.3.1 Press freedom and censorship	568
23.3.2 Broadcasting	569
23.3.3 Press self-regulation	571
23.3.4 The courts' censorship powers	572
23.3.5 Press sources	573
23.3.6 Open justice and the media	574
23.4 Press freedom and reputation: defamation	577
23.4.1 Defences	579
23.5 Press freedom and privacy	583
23.6 'Hate speech'	585
23.6.1 Racism	586
23.6.2 Religion and sexuality	587
23.6.3 Political protest	589
23.7 Freedom of assembly: demonstrations and meetings	589
23.7.1 Statutory police powers	591
23.7.2 Common law police powers	593
23.7.3 Public order offences	595

---

Summary	599
Exercises	600
Further reading	601
24 Government secrecy	602
24.1 Access to government information: open government	602
24.2 The Freedom of Information Act 2000	603
24.2.1 Challenging a refusal to disclose	606
24.3 Other statutory rights to information	607
24.4 State secrecy: suppression of information	608
24.4.1 The Official Secrets Act 1989: criminal law	608
24.4.2 Civil liability: breach of confidence	611
24.5 Public interest immunity	612
24.6 Closed material procedure and special advocates	613
Summary	617
Exercises	617
Further reading	618
25 Exceptional powers: security, emergencies and terrorism	619
25.1 Introduction: the nature of security and emergency measures	619
25.1.1 Security and the courts	620
25.1.2 Derogation	620
25.2 The security and intelligence services	622
25.3 Surveillance, interception and acquisition of information	623
25.3.1 Surveillance	626
25.3.2 Interception of postal, telephone and Internet communications	627
25.3.3 Communications data	628
25.3.4 CCTV cameras	630
25.4 Emergency powers	630
25.5 Anti-terrorism measures	632
25.5.1 Narrowing the definition of terrorism	633
25.5.2 Proscription	634
25.5.3 Arrest and detention	635
25.5.4 Stop and search powers and power of entry	635
25.5.5 Terrorism prevention and investigation measures	637
25.5.6 Terrorist assets	638
25.5.7 Supporting terrorism: the 'Prevent' strategy	639
Summary	640
Exercises	641
Further reading	641
<i>Index</i>	643

## Preface

As in previous editions, the aims of the book are, first, to explain the main principles of United Kingdom constitutional law in the context of the political and legal values that influence their development and, second, to draw attention to the main controversies. The book is intended as a self-contained text for those new to the subject and a starting point for more advanced students.

The major change in this new edition is that Keith Syrett is now the co-author of this book. In this edition Keith is responsible for Parts I, II, IV and V, while John Alder is responsible for Parts III and VI.

While statutory changes have been more limited than in the previous edition, there has been considerable material from the Supreme Court, notably generated directly and indirectly by the adventures of the UK government overseas, and revealing substantial disagreement at the top of the judicial hierarchy. The reach of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) has been extended and the courts have been asked to delve back many years in pursuit of violations of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), but the future of the Act remains unclear. The June 2016 referendum result in favour of leaving the EU has produced (and continues to produce) considerable constitutional uncertainty, including issues as to the role of Parliament, and problems relating to Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The structure of the text remains similar to previous editions. Part I concerns general principles. These include basic constitutional concepts and issues (Chapter 1), a broad account of the political ideals that have influenced the constitution (Chapter 2), and the sources of the constitution (Chapter 3). Chapter 4 provides a brief account of some constitutional landmarks. Chapter 5 provides an overview of the main institutions of government, the most important aspects of which are expanded in later chapters. In Part II, Chapters 6, 7 and 8 concern the underlying legal principles of the rule of law, the separation of powers and parliamentary sovereignty.

Part III concerns international aspects of the constitution. Chapter 9 explains the various ways in which international requirements are filtered into domestic law, the position of dependent territories, expulsion from the UK and the responses of the courts to international issues. Chapter 10 discusses the most important international influence – namely, the EU – which is firmly anchored into domestic law. There is also a discussion of ‘Brexit’, albeit at this stage there is more heat than light on the matter.

Part IV is concerned with the main legislative and executive institutions, and the relationship between them. (The judiciary does not have its own chapter but is discussed in various contexts, especially that of separation of powers.) Chapter 16, ‘Devolution’, has been substantially revised to take account of developments following the referendum on Scottish independence in September 2014 and increasing powers for the Welsh Assembly, as well as events in England.



Parts V and VI deal with the rights of the individual against government. Part V concerns judicial review of government action, the core of administrative law, and includes methods of challenging government action within the government structure.

Part VI, which has been substantially revised, deals with the fundamental rights of the individual. Chapter 21 concerns human rights under the ECHR. Chapter 22 relates these to the HRA. Chapters 23 to 25 focus on human rights issues of particular importance to the constitution. Chapter 23 deals with freedom of expression, focusing on press freedom where recent developments include official intrusion. Chapter 24 deals with government secrecy. Chapter 25 discusses special powers, including emergency powers, interception and surveillance, and anti-terrorist measures. Recent cases have grappled with the very broad definition of terrorism.

As regards further reading, references to books and articles in the text are to writings that expand on the point in question. The 'Further reading' at the end of each chapter discusses fundamental and controversial general issues for those who require greater depth, or more ideas and points of view. These readings have been fully updated for this new edition. Readings considered particularly accessible to and/or significant for students are marked \*. Short references within the text are to the 'Further reading'.

Unless otherwise stated, the main classical works cited throughout are as follows:

Bagehot, *The English Constitution*, ed. Crossman (8th edn, Fontana/Collins 1963)

Dicey, *An Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution* (8th edn,

Macmillan 1915, referenced as last edition for which Dicey was himself

responsible); (10th edn, Macmillan 1958, ed. Wade)

Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Minogue (Dent 1973)

Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Laslett (Cambridge University Press 1960)

Mill, *Utilitarianism, On Liberty and Considerations of Representative Government*, ed.

Acton (Dent 1972)

Montesquieu, 'L'Esprit des Lois', extracted in Stirk and Weigall (eds), *An*

*Introduction to Political Ideas* (Pinter 1995)

Paine, *The Thomas Paine Reader*, ed. Foot and Kramnick (Penguin 1987)

Sincere thanks are due for the contributions and help of Professors Dermot Cahill, Barry Hough, Richard Mullender and Dr Rhiannon Talbot in respect of previous editions, and John Coombes and Chris Handy in respect of this edition. We have updated this edition on the basis of material available on 7 February 2017. Further updates can be found on the companion website: [www.palgravehighered.com/law/conadminlaw11e](http://www.palgravehighered.com/law/conadminlaw11e)

John Alder, Keith Syrett

February 2017

# Table of cases

- A v B (Investigatory Powers Tribunal) [2010] 1 All ER 1149, 471, 539
- A v BBC [2014] 2 All ER 1037, 6, 575
- A v Head Teacher and Governors of Lord Grey School [2004] 4 All ER 628, 505, 540
- A v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2005] 2 AC 68, 122, 178, 187, 467, 518, 526, 548, 621
- A v Secretary of State for the Home Dept (No 2) [2006] 2 AC 221, 502
- A v UK (2003) 36 EHRR 917, 272
- A v UK (2009) 49 EHRR 29, 614
- AA v UK [2011] ECHR 1345, 218
- Abulaziz v UK (1985) 7 EHRR 471, 497
- Adan v Newham LBC [2002] 1 All ER 931, 415
- A-G v Blake [1998] 1 All ER 833, 611
- A-G v BBC [1981] AC 303, 475
- A-G v Crayford Urban DC [1962] Ch 575, 412
- A-G v De Keyser's Royal Hotel Ltd [1920] AC 508, 247, 342, 344, 347, 348, 631
- A-G v English [1983] 1 AC 116, 576
- A-G v Fulham Corp [1921] 1 Ch 440, 85–6, 411
- A-G v Guardian Newspapers Ltd [1987] 3 All ER 316, 611
- A-G v Guardian Newspapers Ltd (No 2) [1990] 1 AC 109, 495, 611
- A-G v Jonathan Cape Ltd [1976] QB 752, 65, 611
- A-G v Levens Magazine Ltd [1979] AC 440, 575
- A-G v National Assembly for Wales Commission [2013] 1 AC 792, 13, 386, 387, 399
- A-G v Observer Ltd [1988] 1 All ER 385, 572
- A-G v Times Newspapers Ltd [1991] 2 All ER 398, 572
- A-G v Wilts United Dairies (1921) 37 TLR 884, 342
- A-G for Canada v Cain [1906] AC 542, 196, 343
- A-G for Ceylon v De Livera [1963] AC 103, 273
- A-G for New South Wales v Trethowan [1932] AC 526, 173
- A-G for Northern Ireland's Reference (No 1) [1977] AC 105, 630
- A-G of Trinidad and Tobago v Lennox Phillip [1995] 1 All ER 93, 346
- A-G's Reference (No 3 of 1999) [2009] UKHL 34, 577
- A-G's Reference (No 3 of 2003) [2004] EWCA Crim 868, 280
- A-G's Reference Re Agricultural Sector (Wales) Bill [2014] UKSC 43, 386, 387
- Agricultural, Horticultural and Forestry Training Board v Aylesbury Mushrooms Ltd [1972] 1 WLR 190, 432
- Agricultural, Horticultural and Forestry Industry Training Board v Kent [1970] 1 All ER 304, 432
- Ahmed v Governing Body of Oxford University [2003] 1 All ER 915, 437
- Ahmad v UK (1981) 4 EHRR 126, 515, 516
- AH v West London Mental Health Tribunal [2011] UKUT 74, 577
- AH (Algeria) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (No 2) [2016] 1 WLR 2071, 204
- AIG Capital Parties Inc v Republic of Kazakhstan [2006] 1 All ER 284, 206
- Air Canada v Secretary of State for Trade (No 2) [1983] 2 AC 394, 612
- AJA and Others v Metropolitan Police Commissioner [2014] 1 All ER 882, 625, 626
- Akumah v Hackney LBC [2005] 2 All ER 148, 412
- Al Adsani v UK (2001) 34 EHRR 273, 205
- Albert v Belgium (1983) 5 EHRR 533, 448
- Albert v Lavin [1982] AC 546, 593
- Ali v Birmingham City Council [2010] 2 All ER 175, 503
- Ali v Bradford City Council [2011] 3 All ER 348, 455
- Al-Jedda v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2014] AC 253, 191, 192
- Al-Maliki v Reyes [2015] EWCA Civ 32, 200, 201, 203, 207
- Al Rawi v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2012] 1 All ER 1, 132, 134, 612, 614, 615
- Al-Saadoon v UK [2010] ECHR 282, 505

- Al Sirri v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2013] 1 AC 745, 215, 633
- Al Skeini v UK (2011) 53 EHRR 18, 530
- AMEC Ltd v Whitefriars City Estates [2005] 1 All ER 723, 437, 445
- Amann v Switzerland [2000] ECHR 88, 623
- Amphitrite v The King [1921] 3 KB 500, 340
- Anderson v Gorrie [1895] 1 QB 668, 143
- Anderson v UK [1997] ECHR 150, 590
- Angelini v Sweden (1986) 51 DR 41, 515
- Animal Defenders International v UK (2013) 57 EHRR 21, 46, 307, 529, 549, 553, 555, 564, 569, 571
- Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission [1969] 2 AC 147, 89, 101, 411, 413–14, 422, 423, 467, 470
- Anufrijeva v Southwark LBC [2004] QB 1124, 455, 514
- Appleby v UK [2003] ECHR 222, 591
- Arrowsmith v Jenkins [1963] 2 QB 561, 596
- Arrowsmith v UK (1978) 3 EHRR 218, 515
- Arthur JS Hall v Simons [2000] 3 All ER 673, 143
- Ashbridge Investments v Minister of Housing and Local Government [1965] 1 WLR 1320, 415
- Ashby v Minister of Immigration [1981] NZLR 222, 418
- Ashby v White (1703) 2 Ld Raym 938, 13, 277
- Ashworth Hospital v MGN Ltd [2001] 1 All ER 991, 574
- Assange v Swedish Prosecution Authority [2012] 2 AC 471, 203, 223
- Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corp [1948] 1 KB 223, 410, 427–31, 433, 448, 449
- Aston Cantlow and Wilmcote with Billesley Parochial Church Council v Wallbank [2003] 3 All ER 1213, 109, 517, 539, 541, 542
- Auckland Harbour Board v R [1924] AC 318, 320
- Austin v Metropolitan Police Comr [2009] 3 All ER 455, 508, 594
- Austin v UK (2012) 55 EHRR 14, 499, 594
- Autronic AG v Switzerland (1990) 12 EHRR 485, 513
- AWG Group Ltd v Morrison [2006] 1 All ER 967, 443
- AXA General Insurance Ltd v HM Advocate [2011] 3 WLR 871, 178, 389, 407, 467
- Ayr Harbour Trustees v Oswald (1883) 8 App Cas 623, 421
- B v UK (2001) 11 BHRC 667, 575
- Bagg's Case (1615) 11 Co Rep 936, 408, 434
- Bah v UK (2012) 54 EHRR 21, 554
- Bank Mellat v HM Treasury (No 1) [2013] 3 WLR 179, 575, 614
- Bank Mellat v HM Treasury (No 2) [2013] UKSC 39, 257, 270, 315, 435, 548, 550, 552, 553, 556, 638, 639
- Barnard v National Dock Labour Board [1953] 2 QB 18, 433
- Baskaya and Okcuola v Turkey (2001) 31 EHRR 292, 565, 567
- Bates' Case (1606) 2 St Tr 371, 76
- BBC v Johns (Inspector of Taxes) [1965] Ch 32, 342
- Beatty v Gillbanks [1882] 9 QBD 308, 596
- Beckett v Midland Electricity plc [2001] 1 WLR 281, 155
- Beghal v DPP [2015] UKSC 49, 508, 512, 545, 546, 636
- Belgian-Linguistic Case (1979–80) 1 EHRR 252, 495, 519
- Belhaj v Straw [2017] UKSC 3, 205, 208, 209
- Belize Alliance of Conservation NGOs v Dept of the Environment [2003] UKPC 63, 447, 457
- Benkharbouche v Embassy of the Republic of Sudan [2015] 3 WLR 301, 203, 205, 206, 207, 236, 238, 535–6
- Bellinger v Bellinger [2003] 2 All ER 593, 537
- Bentham v Netherlands [1986] 8 EHRR 1, 503
- Berkeley v Secretary of State for the Environment [2000] 3 All ER 897, 51, 433
- Bilston Corp v Wolverhampton Corp [1942] Ch 391, 270
- Blackburn v A-G [1971] 2 All ER 1380, 169
- Blecic v Croatia (2004) 41 EHRR 185, 556
- BM v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2010] 1 All ER 847, 616
- Board of Education v Rice [1911] AC 179, 434, 436
- Boddington v British Transport Police [1998] 2 WLR 639, 409, 410, 414, 423, 466
- Bonnard v Perryman [1891] 2 Ch 269, 583
- Bowles v Bank of England [1913] 1 Ch 57, 166, 270, 321
- Bowman v Secular Society Ltd [1917] AC 406, 109, 587
- Bowman v UK (1998) 26 EHRR 1, 49, 306, 564
- Bradlaugh v Gossett (1884) 12 QBD 271, 270
- Brannigan and McBride v UK (1993) 17 EHRR 539, 620

- Breyer Group v Department of Energy and Climate Change [2015] 1 WLR 4559, 517
- Bribery Comr v Ranasinghe [1965] AC 172, 173
- Brind v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [1991] 1 AC 696, 203, 428, 431, 495
- British Chiropractic Association v Singh [2010] EWCA Civ 350, 580
- British Coal Corp v R [1935] AC 500, 169
- British Oxygen Co Ltd v Minister of Technology [1971] AC 610, 420
- British Steel v Customs and Excise Comrs [1997] 2 All ER 366, 466
- Brogan v UK (1989) 11 EHRR 117, 620, 635
- Bromley LBC v GLC [1983] 1 AC 768, 49, 411, 418, 421
- Brown v Board of Education 347 US 483 (1954), 10–11
- Brown v Stott [2001] 2 All ER 97, 502, 548
- Case C-2134/92 Brunner v EU Treaty [1994] 1 CMLR 57, 223
- Brutus v Cozens [1973] AC 854, 596
- Buchanan v Jennings [2005] 2 All ER 273, 273
- Buckley v Valeo 424 US 1 (1976), 52
- Budayeva v Russia (2014) 59 EHRR 2, 506, 517, 554
- Bugdaycay v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [1987] AC 514, 415, 428–9
- Bugg v DPP [1993] QB 473, 423
- Burmah Oil Co Ltd v Bank of England [1980] AC 1090, 602, 612, 613
- Burmah Oil Co Ltd v Lord Advocate [1965] AC 75, 167, 348
- Buron v Denman (1848) 2 Ex 167, 212
- Bushell v Secretary of State for the Environment [1981] AC 75, 372, 437, 480
- Bushell's Case (1670) 6 St Tr 999, 143
- Buttes Gas and Oil Co v Hammer (Nos 2 and 3) [1981] 3 All ER 616, 209
- Calveley v Chief Constable of Merseyside Police [1989] AC 1228, 455
- Calvin v Carr [1980] AC 574, 423, 436
- Calvin's Case (1608) 7 Co Rep 1a, 191, 335
- Cambridge Water Co v English Counties Leather [1994] 2 AC 264, 59
- Campbell v Hall (1774) 1 Cowp 204, 196
- Campbell v MGN Ltd [2004] 2 All ER 995, 38, 543, 550, 583, 584, 630
- Campbell and Cosans v UK (1982) 4 EHRR 293, 515
- Canada (House of Commons) v Vaid [2005] 1 SCR 667, 269
- Carlsen v Rasmussen [1999] 3 CMLR 854, 223
- Carltona Ltd v Comr for Works [1943] 2 All ER 560, 65, 98, 358, 372, 375, 433
- Carl Zeiss Stiftung v Rayner & Keeler Ltd (No 2) [1967] 1 AC 853, 210
- Case of Proclamations (1611) 12 Co Rep 74, 77, 195, 196, 342
- Castells v Spain (1992) 14 EHRR 445, 564, 567, 578, 589
- Caswell v Dairy Produce Quota Tribunal for England and Wales [1990] 2 All ER 434, 564
- Cayman Islands Chief Justice v Cayman Islands Governor [2014] AC 198, 109
- Cestaro v Italy [2015] ECHR 352, 498, 500
- CF v Security Service [2014] 2 All ER 378, 614, 616
- Chagos Islanders v UK (2013) 56 EHRR SE15, 198–9, 530
- Chahal v UK (1996) 23 EHRR 413, 211, 217, 500, 620
- Chandler v DPP [1964] AC 763, 95, 343
- Chapman v Orion Publishing Group Ltd [2008] 1 All ER 750, 581
- Chappell v UK (1987) 53 DR 241, 515
- Charge to the Bristol Grand Jury (1832) 5 C & P 535, 630
- Chase v News Group Newspapers [2003] EMLR 218, 581
- Chatterton v Secretary of State for India in Council (1895) 2 QB 189, 579
- Cheall v Association of Professional, Executive, Clerical and Computer (APEX) [1983] 1 All ER 1130, 436
- Cheney v Conn (Inspector of Taxes) [1968] 1 All ER 779, 167
- Chief Constable of North Wales Police v Evans [1982] 3 All ER 141, 458
- China Navigation Co Ltd v A-G [1932] 2 KB 197, 191
- Church of Scientology of California v Johnson-Smith [1972] 1 QB 522, 276
- Case 283/81 CILFIT Srl v Ministro della Sanita [1982] ECR 3415, 234
- Cinnamond v British Airports Authority [1980] 2 All ER 368, 436
- Citizens United v Federal Election Commission 558 US 50 (2010), 305
- City of London Corp v Samede [2012] 2 All ER 1039, 565, 567, 591

- Clark (Procurator Fiscal Kirkcaldy) v Kelly [2003] 1 All ER 1106, 150
- Clark v University of Lincolnshire and Humberside [2000] 3 All ER 752, 466
- Case T-424/14 and T-424/15 ClientEarth v European Commission (2015), 242, 608
- Clift v Slough BC [2009] 4 All ER 756, 579
- Clooth v Belgium (1992) 14 EHRR 717, 507
- CN v UK (2013) 56 EHRR 24, 501
- Cocks v Thanet DC [1983] 2 AC 286, 465, 466
- Commission for Racial Equality v Dutton [1989] QB 783, 587
- Case 804/79 Commission v UK [1981] ECR 1045, 226
- Comrs of Crown Lands v Page [1960] 2 QB 274, 340
- Coney v Choice [1975] 1 All ER 979, 432
- Congreve v Home Office [1976] QB 629, 342, 411
- Connor v Surrey CC [2010] 3 All ER 905, 455
- Connors v UK (2004) 40 EHRR 189, 510, 511, 512
- Conway v Rimmer [1968] AC 910, 89, 612, 613
- Cook v Alexander [1974] QB 279, 277
- Cooke v Secretary of State for Social Services [2002] 3 All ER 279, 469
- Cooper v Hawkins [1904] 2 KB 164, 341
- Cooper v UK (2004) 39 EHRR 8, 529
- Cooper v Wandsworth Board of Works (1863) 14 CB (NS) 180, 179, 408, 434
- Copsey v WBB Devon Clays Ltd [2005] EWCA Civ 932, 32, 38, 40, 470, 516
- Corporate Officer of the House of Commons v Information Commissioner [2009] 3 All ER 403, 272, 605
- Case 6/64 Costa v ENEL [1964] CMLR 425, 175, 224
- Costello-Roberts v UK (1993) 19 EHRR 112, 500
- Council of Civil Service Unions (CCSU) v Minister for the Civil Service [1985] AC 374, 344, 346, 408, 409, 410, 414, 427, 431, 436, 438, 621
- Countryside Alliance v UK (2010) 50 EHRR SE6, 553, 555
- Cream Holdings v Banerjee [2004] 4 All ER 617, 573
- Creanga v Romania (2013) 56 EHRR 11, 508
- Credit Suisse v Allerdale BC [1996] 4 All ER 129, 409, 423, 458
- Cullen v Chief Constable of the RUC [2004] 2 All ER 237, 9, 455, 466, 540
- Culnane v Morris [2006] 2 All ER 149, 49, 134, 155, 273, 276, 307
- DSD v Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police [2015] 3 WLR 966, 494, 510, 525
- D v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis [2015] 1 WLR 1833, 540, 552, 554
- D v East Berkshire Community Health NHS Trust [2005] 2 AC 373, 130, 455
- D v Home Office [2006] 1 All ER 183, 129, 466
- D v NSPCC [1978] AC 171, 95, 612
- D v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2015] 1 WLR 2217, 499, 548
- Darnall's Case: The Case of the Five Knights (1627) 3 St Tr 1, 76
- Da Silva v UK App. 5878/08 (ECHR, 30 March 2016), 554
- Davy v Spelthorne BC [1984] AC 262, 95, 465
- Case 43/75 Defrenne v Sabena [1976] ECR 455, 236
- Delvigne v Commune de Lesparre-Médoc [2016] 1 WLR 1223, 300
- De Jager v A-G of Natal [1907] AC 326, 191
- Demicoli v Malta (1992) 14 EHRR 47, 268
- Demir v Turkey (2009) 48 EHRR 54, 495
- Derbyshire CC v Times Newspapers Ltd [1993] 1 All ER 1011, 578
- De Wilde v Belgium (1979–80) 1 EHRR 373, 507
- Cases C-293/12 and C-594/12 Digital Rights Ireland v Minister for Communications, Marine and Natural Resources [2014] ECR I-238, 629
- Dickson v UK (2008) 24 BHRC 19, 552
- Dimes v Grand Junction Canal Co (1852) 3 HLC 759, 443
- DM (Zimbabwe) V Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016] 1 WLR 2108, 218
- Doughty v Rolls-Royce plc [1992] 1 CMLR 1045, 236
- Douglas and Zeta-Jones v Hello! Ltd [2001] 2 All ER 289, 498, 543, 573
- DPP v Clarke [1992] Crim LR 60, 597
- DPP v Fidler [1992] 1 WLR 91, 598
- DPP v Head [1959] AC 83, 423
- DPP v Jones [1999] 2 All ER 257, 591
- Dr Bonham's Case (1610) 8 Co Rep 114a, 177, 408, 434
- Duchy of Lancaster Case (1561) 75 ER 325, 74, 335
- Dudgeon v UK (1982) 4 EHRR 149, 552
- Duncan v Jones [1936] 1 KB 218, 593
- Dunlop Rubber Co Ltd v Dunlop [1921] 1 AC 367, 577

- Dunlop v Woollahra Municipal Council [1982] AC 158, 340, 455
- Dunn v R [1896] 1 QB 116, 371
- Duport Steels Ltd v Sirs [1980] 1 All ER 529, 147, 154
- Edinburgh & Dalkeith Railway Co v Wauchope (1842) 8 Cl and F 710, 85, 166
- Edwards v UK (2002) 35 EHRR 487, 509
- Edwards and Lewis v UK (2003) 15 BHRC 189, 613
- Ellen Street Estates Ltd v Minister of Health [1934] 1 KB 590, 168
- Elmbridge BC v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions [2002] Env LR 1, 437
- Engelke v Musmann [1928] AC 433, 210
- Entick v Carrington (1765) 19 St Tr 1029, 85, 95, 341, 410
- Equal Opportunities Commission v Secretary of State for Employment [1994] 1 All ER 910, 176
- Estrada v Al Juffali [2016] 3 WLR 243, 208
- Case 302/87 European Parliament v Council (Comitology) [1988] ECR 5615, 227
- Eweida v UK [2013] ECHR 37, 498, 514, 516, 553, 554
- Ex parte Anderson (1861) 3 E & E 487, 194
- Ex parte Brown (1864) 33 LJ QB 193, 194
- Ex parte Canon Selwyn (1872) 36 JP 54, 171
- Ex parte O'Brian [1923] 2 KB 361, 456
- Ezelin v France (1992) 14 EHRR 362, 590, 594, 595
- Feldbrugge v the Netherlands (1986) 8 EHRR 425, 503
- Financial Times v UK [2009] ECHR 2065, 574
- Findlay v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [1985] AC 318, 435, 439
- Findlay v UK (1997) 24 EHRR 221, 497
- Fisher v R [1903] AC 158, 322
- Fitt v UK (2000) 30 EHRR 480, 613
- Flood v Times Newspapers [2012] UKSC 11, 581
- Florea v Judicial Authority Carei Courthouse Romania [2015] 1 WLR 1953, 218, 500
- Case C-188/89 Foster v British Gas [1990] ECR I-3313, 236
- Fox v Stirk [1970] 2 QB 463, 298
- Francis v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2006] 1 All ER 748, 519
- Francome v Mirror Group Newspapers [1984] 2 All ER 408, 612
- Case 6/90 Francovich v Italy [1991] ECR I-5357, 235, 237, 455
- Franklin v Minister of Town and Country Planning [1948] AC 87, 434, 446
- Fraser v HM Advocate [2011] UKSC 24, 101
- Fredin v Sweden (1991) 13 EHRR 784, 517
- Fressoz v France (1999) 5 BHRC 654, 569
- Furnell v Whangerei High Schools Board [1973] AC 660, 435
- Gallagher v Lynn [1937] AC 863, 386
- Galloway v Telegraph Group [2006] EWCA Civ 17, 581
- Garland v British Rail Engineering Ltd [1983] 2 AC 751, 175
- Gaskin v UK (1990) 12 EHRR 36, 603
- General Medical Council v BBC [1998] 1 WLR 1573, 95, 475
- Ghaidan v Mendoza [2004] 3 All ER 411, 44, 122, 518, 535, 536, 537, 542, 560
- Gibson v East Riding of Yorkshire DC [2000] ICR 890, 235
- Gibson v Lord Advocate [1975] SLT 134, 171
- Gillan and Quinton v UK [2010] ECHR 28, 132, 508, 513, 526, 545, 636
- Gillberg v Sweden (2013) 31 BHRC 247, 602
- Gillick v West Norfolk AHA [1986] AC 112, 407
- Gillies v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2006] 1 All ER 731, 445
- Godden v Hales (1686) 11 St Tr 1165, 76, 79
- Goldsmith v Bhoynul [1998] QB 459, 578
- Goodridge v Chief Constable of Hampshire Constabulary [1999] 1 All ER 896, 612
- Goodwin v UK (2002) 35 EHRR 18, 497, 555, 574
- Gough v UK [2014] ECHR 1156, 553
- Gaughran v Chief Constable of the Police Service of Northern Ireland [2015] 2 WLR 1303, 513, 548
- Gouriet v Union of Post Office Workers [1978] AC 435, 361, 469
- GS (India) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2015] 1 WLR 3312, 218, 500, 512
- Case 230/81 Grand Duchy of Luxembourg v Parliament [1983] 2 CMLR 726, 230
- Guardian News and Media Ltd v AB CD [2014] 4 All ER (D) 88, 576
- Case C-249/96 Grant v South West Trains [1998] ECR I-621, 236
- Case C-167/94 Grau Gomis [1995] ECR I-1023, 240

- Greens v UK (2010) 53 EHRR 710, 299
- Guerra v Italy (1998) 26 EHRR 357, 513, 554, 603
- Guzzardi v Italy (1981) 3 EHRR 333, 508
- H v Lord Advocate [2012] 3 WLR 151, 56, 169, 219, 382, 386, 394
- H v Deputy Prosecutor of the Italian Republic Genoa [2012] 3 WLR 90, 219
- Hall & Co Ltd v Shoreham-By-Sea UDC [1964] 1 All ER 1, 428
- Hamilton v Al Fayed [1999] 3 All ER 317, 180, 274, 277
- Hammersmith and Fulham LBC v Secretary of State for the Environment [1991] 1 AC 521, 429
- Hampshire CC v Beer [2003] EWCA Civ 1056, 462, 464
- Handyside v UK (1976) 1 EHRR 737, 497, 548, 564, 565
- Hanif and Khan v UK (2012) 55 EHRR 16, 442, 444, 526
- Harb v Prince Abdul Aziz Bin Fahd [2015] 1 All ER 77, 207
- Harper v Home Secretary [1955] Ch 238, 303
- Harris v Minister of the Interior [1952] (2) SA 428, 173
- Harris v Sheffield United Football Club [1988] QB 77, 593
- Harrison v Duke of Rutland [1893] 1 QB 142, 590
- Hassan v UK [2014] ECHR 936, 204, 531
- Hatton v UK (2003) 37 EHRR 28, 513, 520, 554, 555
- Hazar and Acik v Turkey (1991) 72 DR 200, 515
- Hazell v Hammersmith and Fulham LBC [1992] 2 AC 1, 412
- Hector v A-G of Antigua and Bermuda [1990] 2 All ER 103, 564
- Helle v Finland (1998) 26 EHRR 159, 448
- Hellewell v Chief Constable of Derbyshire [1995] 4 All ER 473, 611
- Helow v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2009] 2 All ER 1031, 445
- Henry Boot Ltd v Malmaison Hotel Ltd [2001] QB 388, 168
- Hickman v Maisey [1900] 1 QB 752, 590
- Hillingdon LBC v Neary [2011] 4 All ER 584, 552
- Hipperson v Newbury Electoral Registration Officer [1985] QB 1060, 298
- Hirst v UK (No 2) (2006) 42 EHRR 849, 47, 114, 298, 299, 300, 496, 555
- Hirst and Agu v West Yorkshire Chief Constable [1987] 85 Crim App Rep 143, 596
- HJ (Iran) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2010] 3 WLR 386, 217
- HM Advocate v Martin and Miller [2010] UKSC 10, 386
- HM Advocate v Murtagh [2010] 3 WLR 814, 550
- HM Advocate v R [2004] 1 AC 462, 122
- HM v Switzerland (2002) 38 EHRR 314, 39
- HM Treasury v Ahmed [2010] 2 AC 534, 134, 638
- Hoffman-La Roche & Co v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry [1974] 2 All ER 1128, 270, 423
- Homer v Cadman (1886) 16 Cox CC 51, 596
- Holland v Lampen-Wolfe [2000] 1 WLR 1573, 205
- Hone v Maze Prison Board of Visitors [1988] 1 All ER 321, 431, 437
- Hoon v UK [2014] ECHR 1442, 272
- Case C-428/07 Horvath [2009] ECR I-6355, 384-5
- Hounga v Allen [2014] 1 WLR 2889, 203
- HRH Prince of Wales v Associated Newspapers Ltd [2007] 2 All ER 139, 585
- Hristozov v Bulgaria [2012] ECHR 608, 553
- HSE v Wolverhampton City Council [2012] UKSC 34, 418
- Huang v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2007] UKHL 11, 217, 467
- Hubbard v Pitt [1976] QB 142, 590
- Hutchinson- Reid v UK [2003] ECHR 94, 507
- Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Lord Advocate [2012] UKSC 61, 387
- Incal v Turkey (2000) 29 EHRR 449, 587
- Independent News and Media Ltd v A [2010] EWCA Civ 343, 577
- Independent Schools Council v Charity Commission for England and Wales [2012] 1 All ER 127, 45, 469
- In Re G (A Child) (Same-sex Relationship: Family Life Declaration) [2015] 1 WLR 826, 540
- In Re G (Adoption) (Unmarried Couple) [2009] 1 AC 173, 36, 518, 519
- In Re McCaughey [2011] UKSC 20, 509, 527, 532, 533
- In Re McKerr [2004] 1 WLR 807, 59, 202, 496, 532, 534, 538
- In Re Recovery of Medical Costs for Asbestos Diseases [2015] 2 WLR 481, 517, 548, 550, 552, 554, 555, 556

- Interbrew SA v Competition Commission [2001] EWHC 367 (Admin), 485
- International Transport Roth GmbH v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2003] QB 728, 178
- Case 11/70 Internationale Handelsgesellschaft v Einfuhr-und Vorratsstelle fur Getreide und Futtermittel [1970] ECR 1125, 175
- Invercargill City Council v Hamlin [1996] AC 624, 127
- IPSA v Information Commissioner [2015] EWCA Civ 388, 604
- IR (Sri Lanka) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2011] 4 All ER 908, 348, 448, 512
- IRC v National Federation of Self-Employed and Small Business Ltd [1982] AC 617, 460
- Ireland v UK [1978] ECHR 1, 500
- ISKCON v UK (1994) 76A DR 90, 515
- Jackson v Attorney General [2006] 1 AC 262, 5, 101, 138, 154, 155, 161, 163, 164, 165, 166, 171, 172, 173–4, 176, 178, 180, 182, 265, 266, 283, 289, 352
- Jameel v Wall Street Journal Europe [2006] 4 All ER 1279, 581
- James v UK (2013) 56 EHRR 12, 459, 496, 497, 507
- Janah v Libya UKEAT/0401/12/GE (2013), 235, 535, 537
- Janowiec v Russia (2013) 58 EHRR 792, 532, 533
- Jasper v UK (2000) 30 EHRR 441, 613
- Jeewan Mohit v DPP of Mauritius [2006] UKPC 20, 361
- Jeffer v New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board [1967] 1 AC 551, 434
- Jersild v Denmark (1994) 19 EHRR 1, 567, 569, 570
- Jessemey v Rowstock [2014] EWCA Civ 185, 236
- JIH v News Group Newspapers Ltd [2011] EWCA Civ 42, 585
- John v Express Newspapers Ltd [2000] 3 All ER 257, 574
- John v Mirror Group Newspapers Ltd [1996] 3 WLR 593, 582
- John v Rees [1969] 2 All ER 274, 436
- Case C-222/84 Johnston v Chief Constable of Royal Ulster Constabulary [1986] ECR 1651, 237
- Johnstone v Pedlar [1921] 2 AC 262, 212
- Jones v Ministry of Interior of Saudi Arabia [2007] 1 All ER 113, 39, 200, 201, 205
- Jones v UK (2014) 59 EHRR 1, 205
- Jordan v Burgoyne [1963] 2 QB 744, 597
- Joseph v Spiller [2011] 1 All ER 947, 579
- Joyce v DPP [1946] AC 347, 191
- Kapri v Lord Advocate [2013] 4 All ER 599, 217
- Kay v Lambeth LBC [2006] 2 AC 465, 499
- Kay v Metropolitan Police Comr [2008] UKHL 69, 592
- Kaye v Robertson [1991] FSR 62, 583
- Keegan v Ireland (1994) 18 EHRR 342, 498
- Keighley's Case (1609) 10 Co Rep 139, 407
- Keighley v Bell (1866) 4 F and F 763, 630
- Kenedi v Hungary (2009) 27 BHRC 335, 602
- Kennedy v Charity Commission [2014] UKSC 20, 431, 494, 520, 525, 528, 529, 552, 574, 602, 603, 604
- Kennedy v UK (2011) 52 EHRR 4, 614
- Keyu v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs [2015] UKSC 69, 197, 200, 212, 494, 510, 528, 529, 531, 533–4, 548
- Khan v UK (2001) 31 EHRR 1016, 623
- Khawaja v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [1983] 1 All ER 765, 415, 456
- Kinloch v HM Advocate [2013] 2 AC 93, 595
- Kirklees MBC v Wickes Building Supplies Ltd [1992] 3 All ER 717, 237
- Klass v Federal Republic of Germany (1979–80) 2 EHRR 214, 122, 539, 620
- Kodeeswaren v A-G for Ceylon [1970] AC 1111, 371
- Kokkinakis v Greece (1994) 17 EHRR 397, 514, 544
- Kostovski v Netherlands (1989) 12 EHRR 434, 497
- Kuwait Airways v Iraqi Airways (No 1) [1995] 3 All ER 694, 206
- Kuwait Airways v Iraqi Airways (Nos 4 and 5) [2002] 2 AC 883, 209
- Kuznetov v Russia [2008] ECHR 1170, 564, 590
- Lachaux v Independent Print Ltd [2016] 2 WLR 437, 577
- La Generale des Carrieres et de Mines v FG Hemisphere Associates LLC [2013] 1 All ER 409, 206
- Laker Airways Ltd v Dept of Trade [1977] QB 643, 341, 348
- Lavender & Son Ltd v Minister of Housing and Local Government [1970] 3 All ER 871, 421
- Lawal v Northern Spirit Ltd [2004] 1 All ER 187, 445



- Lawless v Ireland (No 3) (1961) 1 EHRR 15, 620, 621
- Leach v Money (1765) 19 St Tr 1001, 85
- Leander v Sweden (1987) 9 EHRR 433, 602
- Lee v Bude and Torrington Railway Co (1871) LR 6 CP 576, 85, 166
- Leech v Parkhurst Prison Deputy Governor [1988] 1 All ER 485, 435
- Lee-Hirons v Secretary of State for Justice [2016] UKSC 46, 507, 540
- Liberal Party v UK (1982) 4 EHRR 106, 295
- Lingens v Austria (1986) 8 EHRR 103, 552, 564, 578
- Lindon v France [2007] ECHR 836, 564
- Lindsay v UK [1979] 3 CMLR 166, 295
- Lion Laboratories Ltd v Evans [1985] QB 526, 611
- Liversidge v Anderson [1942] AC 206, 621
- Lloyd v McMahon [1987] 1 All ER 1118, 436
- Local Government Board v Arlidge [1915] AC 120, 434
- Lochner v New York 198 US 45 (1905), 11
- Locobail (UK) v Bayfield Properties [2000] QB 451, 444
- London and Clydeside Estates Ltd v Aberdeen District Council [1979] 3 All ER 876, 423
- Lonrho v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry [1989] 2 All ER 609, 447
- Lord Advocate v Dumbarton DC [1990] 2 AC 580, 341
- Lord Advocate v The Scotsman Publications Ltd [1990] 1 AC 812, 610
- M v Home Office (QBD) [1992] 4 All ER 97
- M v Home Office (CA) [1992] QB 270, 139
- M v Home Office (HL) [1993] 3 All ER 537, 77, 96, 129, 132, 147, 238, 336, 340, 454
- M v Italy and Bulgaria App. 40020/03 (ECtHR, 31 Jul 2012), 501
- McC v Mullan [1984] 3 All ER 908, 143
- McCann v UK (1995) 21 EHRR 97, 630
- McCartan Turkington Breen v Times Newspapers Ltd [2001] 2 AC 277, 51, 568
- MacCormick v Lord Advocate [1953] SC 369, 171
- MacFarlane v Tayside Health Board [2000] 2 AC 59, 127
- MacLaine Watson and Co Ltd v Dept of Trade and Industry [1990] 2 AC 418, 202, 203
- Madzimbamuto v Lardner-Burke [1969] 1 AC 645, 6, 167
- Mahon v Air New Zealand Ltd [1984] 3 All ER 201, 437
- Makudi v Baron Triesman of Tottenham [2014] 3 All ER 36, 273
- Malone v Metropolitan Police Comr [1979] Ch 344, 130, 342, 495, 623
- Malone v UK (1984) 7 EHRR 14, 583, 623
- Manchester City Council v Pinnock [2010] 3 WLR 1441, 448, 514, 527, 528, 539, 543, 554
- Mandla v Dowell-Lee [1983] 1 All ER 1062, 587
- Manuel v A-G [1982] 3 All ER 822, 167, 169, 172, 173
- Marais v General Officer Commanding [1902] AC 109, 631
- Marbury v Madison (1803) 1 Cranch 14, 165, 168
- Marcic v Thames Water Utilities Ltd [2004] 1 All ER 135, 377, 455, 513, 517, 554
- Marckx v Belgium (1979) 2 EHRR 330, 517
- Case C-62/00 Marks and Spencer [2002] ECR I-6325, 236
- Case C-106/89 Marleasing SA v La Comercial Internacional de Alimentacion SA [1992] 1 CMLR 305, 236
- Case 152/81 Marshall v Southampton and South West Hampshire Area HA (No 1) [1986] ECR 723, 236
- Matthews v UK (1998) 28 EHRR 361, 238
- Maslov v Austria [2009] INLR 47, 217
- Matthews v Ministry of Defence [2003] 1 AC 1163, 502, 556
- Matthieu-Mohun v Belgium (1988) 10 EHRR 1, 287, 295
- Maxwell v Dept of Trade and Industry [1974] 2 All ER 122, 436
- Mayor of London v Hall [2011] 1 WLR 504, 591
- McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd v Richmond upon Thames LBC [1991] 4 All ER 897, 342, 411, 412
- McDonald v Chicago 561 US 742 (2010), 11
- McDonald v Kensington and Chelsea Royal London BC [2011] 4 All ER 881, 554
- McDonald v UK [2014] ECHR 492, 512, 554
- McDonald v McDonald [2016] UKSC 28, 518, 543, 583, 591
- McGonnell v UK (2000) 30 EHRR 289, 142
- McIlkenny v Chief Constable of West Midlands Police [1980] 2 All ER 227, 16, 33
- McInnes v Onslow-Fane [1978] 3 All ER 211, 435, 446

- McLaren v Home Office [1990] IRLR 338, 464  
McLeod v UK (1999) 27 EHRR 493, 594  
Meerabux v A-G of Belize [2005] 2 AC 513, 443  
Mellacher v Austria (1989) 12 EHRR 391, 517  
Mighell v Sultan of Johore [1894] 1 QB 149, 207  
Millar v Dickson [2002] 3 All ER 1041, 142  
Minister of State for Immigration and Ethnic  
affairs ex parte Teoh (1995) 183 CLR 273, 439  
Ministry of Justice, Lithuania v Bucnys [2014] 2  
All ER 235, 215  
Miss Behavin' v Belfast City Council [2007] 3 All  
ER 1007, 556, 567  
MM v UK [2012] ECHR 1906, 513  
Mohammed v Ministry of Defence [2016] 2 WLR  
247, 199, 200, 204, 211, 212, 531  
Monson v Tussauds Ltd [1894] 1 QB 671, 583  
Moohan v Lord Advocate [2015] AC 901, 505, 528  
Mortensen v Peters (1906) 14 SLT 227, 167  
Mouvement Raelien Suisse v Switzerland (2013)  
56 EHRR 14, 564  
MT (Algeria) v Secretary of State for the Home  
Office [2010] 2 AC 110, 496, 499  
Murphy v Ireland (2004) 38 EHRR 212, 571  
Mutasa v A-G [1980] QB 114, 191
- Nairn v University of St Andrews [1909] AC 147, 59  
Nakkuda Ali v Jayaratne [1951] AC 66, 430  
National Farmers Union v Secretary of State for  
the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
[2003] EWHC 444 (Admin), 346  
New York Times Co v Sullivan 376 US 254 (1964),  
578  
Nissan v A-G [1970] AC 179, 212, 342  
NML Capital Ltd v Republic of Argentina [2011]  
4 All ER 1191, 206  
Norris v Government of the USA [2010] UKSC 9,  
215, 219  
Norwest Holst v Trade Secretary [1978] Ch 201,  
435  
Nottinghamshire CC v Secretary of State for the  
Environment [1986] AC 240, 326, 429
- Oberschlick v Austria (1995) 19 EHRR 389, 578  
Observer and Guardian Newspapers v UK (1992)  
14 EHRR 153, 566, 611  
Odelola v Secretary of State for the Home Dept  
[2009] UKHL 25, 133, 193, 439  
Office of Government Commerce v Information  
Commissioner [2008] EWHC 774 (Admin), 275
- Official Solicitor v K [1965] AC 201, 575  
O'Halloran and Francis v UK (2008) 46 EHRR  
397, 502  
O'Moran v DPP [1975] 1 All ER 473, 597  
Onu v Akwivu [2016] 1 WLR 2653, 520  
Open Door and Dublin Well Woman v Ireland  
(1992) 15 EHRR 244, 539, 553, 566  
O'Reilly v Mackman [1982] 3 All ER 1124, 414,  
440, 465, 466, 476  
Oscar v Chief Constable of the RUC [1992] NI  
290, 635  
Othman (Abu Qatada) v UK [2012] ECHR 56,  
218, 502  
Osman v UK (1998) 29 EHRR 245, 506  
Otto Preminger Institut v Austria (1994) 19 EHRR  
34, 567, 588
- Padfield v Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and  
Food [1968] AC 997, 90, 416, 447  
Page v Hull University Visitor [1993] 1 All ER 97,  
409, 414, 468, 469  
Pankina v Secretary of State [2011] 1 All ER 1043, 194  
Parlement Belge, The (1880) LR 5 PD 197, 205  
Paty's Case (1704) 2 Ld Raym 1105, 277  
Case 294/83 Parti Ecologiste 'Les Verts' v  
European Parliament [1986] ECR 1339, 223  
Pearlman v Governors and Keepers of Harrow  
School [1979] QB 56, 414  
Peck v UK (2003) 13 BHRC 669, 630  
Pendragon v UK App 31416/96 (ECtHR, 19 Oct  
1998), 515  
Pentikinen v Finland [2014] ECHR 106, 594  
Pepper v Hart [1993] AC 593, 155, 161, 273, 275, 620  
Petrovoc v Austria (1998) 33 EHRR 307, 553  
Pfeifer v Austria (2007) 48 EHRR 175, 511  
Pham v Secretary of State for the Home  
Department [2015] 1 WLR 1591, 192, 203, 223,  
225, 494  
Phillips v News Group Newspapers [2013] 1 AC  
1, 585  
Phillips v UK [2001] ECHR 437, 504  
Pickin v British Railways Board [1974] AC 765,  
147, 163, 166, 270, 284, 318  
Pickwell v Camden LBC [1983] QB 962, 418  
Case 11/82 Piraiki-Patraiki v Commission [1985]  
ECR 207, 233  
Plattform 'Arzte fur das Leben' v Austria (1988)  
13 EHRR 204, 594  
Plessy v Ferguson 163 US 537 (1896), 10

- Ponomaryov v Bulgaria (2014) 59 EHRR 20, 552
- Poplar Housing and Regeneration Community Association Ltd v Donoghue [2001] 4 All ER 604, 95, 463, 470, 542, 551
- Porter v Magill [2002] 1 All ER 465, 416, 443, 444, 445
- Prebble v Television New Zealand [1995] 1 AC 321, 273
- Prescott v Birmingham Corp [1955] Ch 210, 411, 418
- Preston v IRC [1985] 2 All ER 327, 438
- Preston v Supplementary Benefits Appeal Tribunal [1975] 1 WLR 624, 469
- Pretty v UK (2002) 35 EHRR 1, 512, 514, 549
- Primov v Russia [2014] ECHR 605, 593
- Prince's Case (1606) 8 Co Rep 1, 166
- Case C-370/12 Pringle v Ireland [2013] 2 CMLR 2, 233
- Prohibitions del Roy (1607) 12 Co Rep 64, 58, 77, 99, 121, 147, 335
- Provident Mutual Life Assurance Association v Derby City Council [1981] 1 WLR 173, 434
- Case 148/78 Pubblico Ministero v Ratti [1979] ECRI- 1629, 236
- Quark Fishing Ltd v UK (2007) 44 EHRR SE4, 199, 525
- R (A) v Croydon LBC [2009] 1 WLR 2557, 415, 503
- R (A) v Secretary of State for Health [2010] 1 All ER 87, 191
- R (A) v Secretary of State for Health [2015] EWCA Civ 771, 554
- R (A) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2006] EWHC 526 (Admin), 440
- R (AB) v Secretary of State for Justice [2010] 2 All ER 151, 428, 512, 549
- R (Abassi) v Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office [2002] EWCA Civ 1598, 211, 438
- R (Agyarko) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2015] EWCA Civ 440, 218
- R (Aguilar Quila) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2012] 1 AC 621, 549
- R (Akpinar) v Upper Tribunal [2015] 1 WLR 466, 218
- R (Alconbury Developments Ltd) v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions [2001] 2 All ER 929, 48, 179, 372, 407, 431, 433, 469, 480, 501, 502, 503, 504, 526, 529
- R (Al-Hasan) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2005] 1 All ER 927, 446
- R (Al Jedda) v Secretary of State for Defence [2008] 1 AC 332, 204
- R (Al Rawi) v Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office [2007] 2 WLR 1219, 211
- R (Al-Saadoon) v Secretary of State for Defence (QBD) [2015] EWHC 715 (Admin), 494, 506, 507, 509
- R (Al-Saadoon) v Secretary of State for Defence (CA) [2016] EWCA Civ 811, 200, 530, 561
- R (Al-Skeini) v Secretary of State for Defence [2008] 1 AC 153, 496, 530
- R (Alvi) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2012] 1 WLR 2208, 133, 194, 213, 328, 343, 347, 348
- R (Amin) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2004] 1 AC 653, 509, 510
- R (Anderson) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2002] 4 All ER 1089, 132, 147, 148, 536
- R (Animal Defenders International) v Culture Secretary [2008] 1 AC 1312, 122, 529, 538, 547, 553, 564, 565, 570, 571
- R (Antoniou) v Central and North London NHS Trust [2013] EWHC 3055 (Admin), 510
- R (Anufrijeva) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2003] 3 All ER 827, 125, 132
- R (Association of British Civilian Internees; Far East Region) v Secretary of State for the Defence [2003] QB 1397, 431
- R (Baiai) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2007] 4 All ER 199, 504
- R (Bancoult) v Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (No 1) (QBD) [2001] QB 1067, 57, 198
- R (Bancoult) v Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (No 2) (CA) [2008] QB 365, 336
- R (Bancoult) v Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (No 2) (HL) [2008] 4 All ER 1055, 147, 163, 196, 197, 198, 199, 204, 211, 334, 346, 438, 439, 469, 554
- R (Bancoult) v Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (No 4) [2016] 3 WLR 157, 199
- R (Barclay) v Secretary of State for Justice [2014] 3 WLR 1142, 194, 197, 346, 530
- R (BB) v SIAC [2011] 4 All ER 210, 614

- R (BB) v SIAC [2012] 1 All ER 229, 503
- R (BBC) v Secretary of State for Justice [2012] 2 All ER 1089, 549, 564, 566
- R (Begum) v Head Teacher and Governors of Denbigh High School [2007] 1 AC 100, 43, 448, 499, 515, 548
- R (Bernard) v Enfield LBC [2002] EWHC 2282 (Admin), 514
- R (Bibi) v Newham LBC [2002] 1 WLR 237, 440
- R (Bibi) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2015] 1 WLR 5055, 193
- R (Black) v Secretary of State for Justice [2009] UKHL 1, 148
- R (Bloggs61) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2003] 1 WLR 2724, 469
- R (Boggis) v Natural England [2010] 1 All ER 159, 462
- R (Boyejo) v Barnet LBC [2009] EWHC 3261 (Admin), 433
- R (Bradley) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2008] EWCA Civ 36, 478
- R (Bright) v Secretary of State for Justice [2014] [2015] 1 WLR 723, 547, 553
- R (British American Tobacco UK Ltd) v Secretary of State for Health [2004] EWHC 2493 (Admin), 567
- R (Brown) (Jamaica) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2015] 1 WLR 1060, 215
- R (Bulger) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2001] 3 All ER 449, 417, 460, 461
- R (C) v Secretary of State for Justice [2016] UKSC 2, 574
- R (Carson) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2006] 1 AC 173, 519
- R (Cart) v Upper Tribunal (CA) [2010] 1 All ER 908, 126, 134
- R (Cart) v Upper Tribunal (SC) [2012] 1 AC 663, 102, 129, 144, 407, 414, 459, 467, 469, 470, 475, 476
- R (Catt) v Association of Chief Police Officers [2015] UKSC 9, 512, 545, 546, 547, 549, 595
- R (Chester) v Secretary of State for Justice [2014] 1 All ER 683, 13, 32, 44, 47, 294, 298, 299, 528, 537
- R (Chief Constable of the West Midlands Police) v Birmingham City Justices [2002] EWHC 1087 (Admin), 433
- R (Condliff) v North Staffordshire NHS Trust [2011] EWCA Civ 910, 418, 469, 512, 552, 554
- R (Confederation of Passenger Transport (UK) Ltd) v Humber Bridge Board [2004] 4 All ER 533, 453
- R (Conville) v Richmond on Thames LBC [2006] EWCA Civ 718, 419
- R (Corbett) v Restormel Borough Council [2001] EWCA Civ 330, 423
- R (Core Issues Trust) v Transport for London [2014] EWCA Civ 34, 565
- R (Corner House Research) v Director of the Serious Fraud Office [2008] 4 All ER 927, 122, 123, 149, 204, 468
- R (Countryside Alliance) v A-G [2008] 1 AC 719, 179, 499, 513, 518, 551, 590
- R (Deepdock Ltd) v Welsh Ministers [2007] EWHC 3347 (Admin), 401
- R (DPP) v Havering Magistrates Court [2001] 3 All ER 997, 504
- R (Douglas) v North Tyneside DC [2004] 1 All ER 709, 469, 505, 518
- R (Dudson) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2006] 1 All ER 421, 437
- R (Edwards) v Environment Agency [2004] 3 All ER 21, 461
- R (Electoral Commission) v City of Westminster Magistrates Court [2010] 1 All ER 1167, 307
- R (Evans) v Attorney General (QBD) [2013] EWHC 1960 (Admin), 6
- R (Evans) v Attorney General (CA) [2014] EWCA Civ 254, 12, 430
- R (Evans) v Attorney General (SC) [2015] UKSC 21, 6, 62, 65, 606, 608
- R (Evans) v Lord Chancellor [2012] 1 WLR 838, 133
- R (Farrakhan) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2002] QB 1391, 468, 554, 555
- R (FDA) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2012] 3 All ER 301, 418
- R (Feakins) v Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [2004] 1 WLR 1761, 460
- R (G) v Barnet LBC [2004] 1 All ER 97, 419
- R (G) v Governors of X School [2012] 1 AC 167, 502, 503
- R (G) v Immigration Appeal Tribunal [2004] 3 All ER 286, 459, 467, 470
- R (Gentle) v Prime Minister [2008] 1 AC 1356, 210, 468
- R (Gillan) v Metropolitan Police Comr [2006] 4 All ER 1041, 513, 546, 621, 630, 636

- R (GS (India)) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2015] 1 WLR 3312, 218, 500, 512
- R (Guardian Newspapers) v City of Westminster Magistrates Court [2013] QB 618, 575
- R (Gul) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2014] AC 1260, 633
- R (Haney and others) v Secretary of State for Justice [2014] UKSC 66, 496, 529
- R (Heather) v Leonard Cheshire Foundation [2002] 2 All ER 936, 464
- R (Hemmings) v Prime Minister [2006] EWHC 2831 (Admin), 352
- R (Herron) v Parking Adjudicator [2012] 1 All ER 709, 432
- R (Hirst) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2002] EWHC 602 (Admin), 566
- R (Hooper) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2006] 1 All ER 487, 348, 470, 519
- R (HS2 Action Alliance Ltd) v Secretary of State for Transport [2014] 1 WLR 324, 47, 48, 55, 147, 169, 175, 176, 177, 237, 270, 272, 275, 318, 353
- R (Hurst) v North London District Coroner [2007] 2 All ER 1025, 536
- R (Ismail) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016] 1 WLR 2814, 216
- R (Johnson) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016] UKSC 56, 190
- R (JS, Sri Lanka) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2011] 1 AC 184, 203, 215
- R (Kambadzi) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2011] 4 All ER 975, 132, 436
- R (Kaur) v ILEX Appeal Tribunal [2012] 1 All ER 1435, 443, 446, 485
- R (KM) v Cambridgeshire CC [2012] 3 All ER 1218, 418, 427, 428
- R (Kurdistan Workers' Party) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2002] EWHC 644 (Admin), 633
- R (L) v Metropolitan Police Comr [2010] 1 All ER 113, 550
- R (L) v Secretary of State for Justice [2009] 1 AC 588, 510
- R (Laporte) v Chief Constable of Gloucestershire [2007] 2 AC 105, 547, 548, 593, 594
- R (Limbuela) v Secretary of State for Social Security [2007] 1 All ER 951, 500
- R (Litvinenko) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2014] EWHC 194 (Admin), 428
- R (London Christian Radio Ltd) v Radio Advertising Clearance Centre [2014] 1 WLR 307, 571
- R (Long) v Secretary of State for Defence [2015] EWCA Civ 770, 506
- R (Lord Carlile of Berriew) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2014] 3 WLR 1404, 210, 211, 548, 552, 554, 555, 566
- R (Lumba) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2012] 1 AC 245, 421, 422, 435, 436, 507
- R (M) v Gateshead Council [2007] 1 All ER 1262, 419
- R (MM) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2016] 1 WLR 2858, 190
- R (Mayaya) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2012] 1 All ER 1491, 194, 422
- R (MacLeod) v Governors of the Peabody Trust [2016] EWHC 737 (Admin), 542
- R (Miller) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union (QBD) [2016] EWHC 2768 (Admin), 202
- R (Miller) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union (SC) [2017] UKSC 5, 101, 223, 224, 225-6, 234, 246, 247, 250, 254
- R (McLellan) v Bracknell Forest BC [2002] 1 All ER 899, 543
- R (Middleton) v West Sussex Coroner [2004] 2 AC 182, 506, 509,
- R (Miranda) v Secretary of State for The Home Department [2016] 1 WLR 1505, 538, 546, 553, 554, 573, 634, 636
- R (Mohamed) v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs [2010] 3 WLR 554, 133, 144, 554, 567, 574, 576, 621
- R (Morge) v Hampshire County Council [2011] 1 WLR 268, 234
- R (Morris) v Westminster City Council [2005] 1 All ER 351, 518
- R (Moseley) v Harringey LBC [2014] UKSC 56, 433
- R (Munir) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2012] 1 WLR 2192, 328, 347, 348
- R (Nicklinson) v Ministry of Justice [2014] UKSC 38, 59, 101, 146, 529, 537, 550, 556
- R (Nilsen) v Governor of Full Sutton Prison [2004] EWCA Civ 1540, 566
- R (Osborn) v Parole Board [2013] UKSC 61, 494, 520
- R (P) v Secretary of State for Justice [2016] 1 WLR 2009, 545

- R (Pelling) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2011] EWHC 3291 (Admin), 275
- R (Pretty) v DPP [2002] 1 All ER 1, 505, 525, 529
- R (Privacy International) v Revenue and Customs Commissioners [2015] 1 WLR 397, 603
- R (ProLife Alliance) v BBC [2003] 2 All ER 977, 308, 467, 469, 553, 554, 565, 566, 570
- R (Public and Commercial Services Union) v Minister for the Civil Service [2010] EWHC 1027 (Admin), 155
- R (Purdy) v DPP [2009] 4 All ER 1147, 126, 420, 512, 547
- R (Q) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2003] 2 All ER 905, 155
- R (Quintavalle) v Secretary of State for Health [2003] 2 All ER 113, 238, 461
- R (R) v Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Times Law Report, 9 Sep 2016, 528
- R (Rashid) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2005] EWCA Civ 744, 439, 442
- R (Razgar) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2004] 3 All ER 821, 511
- R (Reilly) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (CA) [2013] EWCA Civ 66, 275
- R (Reilly) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (SC) [2014] AC 453, 432, 435, 501
- R (Reprotech (Pebsham) Ltd) v East Sussex CC [2003] 1 WLR 348, 421, 437, 448
- R (RK (Nepal)) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2009] EWCA Civ 359, 458
- R (RMC) v Metropolitan Police Commissioner [2012] 4 All ER 510, 595
- R (Roberts) v Metropolitan Police Commissioner [2015] UKSC 79, 512, 546
- R (Roberts) v Parole Board [2006] 1 All ER 39, 26, 134, 614
- R (Rogers) v Swindon Primary Health Care Trust [2006] EWCA Civ 392, 417
- R (S) v Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police [2004] 4 All ER 193, 513, 518, 549, 551
- R (S) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2013] 1 All ER 66, 470
- R (Sandiford) v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs [2014] 4 All ER 843, 344, 347, 421, 468
- R (SG) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2015] UKSC 16, 202, 203, 204, 496
- R (Sinclair Gardens Investments) v Lands Tribunal [2005] EWCA Civ 1305, 469
- R (Sivasubramaniam) v Wandsworth County Court [2003] 1 WLR 475, 459
- R (Smith) v Parole Board [2005] 1 All ER 755, 437
- R (Smith) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2006] 1 All ER 407, 149
- R (Southall) v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs [2003] EWCA Civ 1002, 113
- R (ST) (Eritrea) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2012] 3 All ER 1037, 203
- R (T) v Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police [2015] AC 49, 204, 545, 547
- R (Theophilus) v Lewisham LBC [2002] 3 All ER 851, 440
- R (Tigere) v Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills [2015] 1 WLR 3820, 498, 505, 519, 552, 554
- R (TN (Afghanistan)) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2015] 1 WLR 3083, 215, 238
- R (Trafford) v Blackpool Borough Council [2014] 2 All ER 947, 463, 464
- R (Ullah) v Special Adjudicator [2004] 3 All ER 785, 134, 217, 527, 528
- R (Walker) v Secretary of State for Justice [2010] 1 AC 553, 459
- R (West) v Lloyds of London [2004] 3 All ER 251, 463
- R (Wheeler) v Office of the Prime Minister [2008] EWHC 936 (Admin), 442
- R (Wilford) v FSA [2013] EWCA Civ 677, 458
- R (Williamson) v Secretary of State for Education and Employment [2005] 2 All ER 1, 36, 275, 499, 505, 514, 515, 523, 548, 553, 556
- R (Wood) v Metropolitan Police Commissioner [2009] 4 All ER 951, 595
- R (Woolas) v Speaker of the House of Commons [2012] QB 1, 308, 309, 466
- R (Wright) v Secretary of State for Health [2009] 2 All ER 129, 503, 512
- R (Youssef) v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs [2016] 2 WLR 509, 201, 211, 494, 500
- R (Zhang) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2014] 2 All ER 560, 459
- R v A [2001] 3 All ER 1, 535, 536, 537, 538, 552
- R v Abdricov [2007] 1 WLR 2679, 444
- R v Army Board of the Defence Council ex parte Anderson [1992] QB 169, 436

- R v Barnsley Licencing Justices [1960] 2 QB 167, 446
- R v Barnsley Metropolitan BC ex parte Hook [1976] 3 All ER 452, 430
- R v Blackman [2015] 1 WLR 1900, 520
- R v Bolton (1841) 1 QB 66, 412
- R v Bottrill ex parte Kuechenmeister [1947] KB 41, 210
- R v Boundary Commission for England ex parte Foot [1983] 1 All ER 1099, 295, 304, 454, 458
- R v Bow Street Stipendiary Magistrate ex parte Pinochet Ugarte (No 2) [1999] 1 All ER 577, 443, 446
- R v Bow Street Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate ex parte Pinochet Ugarte (No 3) [1999] 2 All ER 97, 135, 207
- R v Brent HA ex parte Francis [1985] 1 All ER 74, 608
- R v Broadcasting Complaints Commission ex parte Owen [1985] QB 1153, 308
- R v Brown [1993] 2 All ER 75, 361, 612
- R v Burah (1878) 3 App Cas 889, 195
- R v Burns (1886) 16 Cox CC 395, 589
- R v Camborne Justices ex parte Pearce [1955] 1 QB 41, 443
- R v Cambridge HA ex parte B [1995] 2 All ER 129, 469
- R v Casement [1917] 1 KB 98, 191
- R v Central Criminal Court ex parte Bright, Alton, Rusbridger [2001] 2 All ER 244, 573
- R v Chaytor (CA) [2010] EWCA Crim 1910, 267
- R v Chaytor (SC) [2011] 1 AC 684, 129–30, 268, 270, 271–2, 273, 274, 277, 278, 281
- R v Chief Constable of Devon and Cornwall Constabulary ex parte Central Electricity Generating Board [1981] 3 All ER 826, 593
- R v Chief Constable of Sussex ex parte International Trader's Ferry Ltd [1999] 1 All ER 129, 427, 428, 593
- R v Chief Constable of the Merseyside Police ex parte Calveley [1986] QB 424, 459
- R v Chief Rabbi ex parte Wachmann [1993] 2 All ER 249, 464
- R v City of Westminster Housing Benefit Review Board ex parte Mehanne [2001] 2 All ER 690, 417
- R v Civil Service Appeals Board ex parte Bruce [1988] 3 All ER 686, 371
- R v Civil Service Appeals Board ex parte Cunningham [1991] 4 All ER 310, 371, 447
- R v Cornwall CC ex parte Huntingdon [1994] 1 All ER 694, 470
- R v Cosford [2013] 3 All ER 649, 111
- R v Coventry City Council ex parte Phoenix Aviation [1995] 3 All ER 37, 593
- R v Criminal Injuries Compensation Board ex parte A [1999] 2 AC 330, 415
- R v Criminal Injuries Compensation Board ex parte Lain [1967] 2 QB 864, 344
- R v Criminal Injuries Compensation Board ex parte P [1995] 1 All ER 870, 346
- R v Criminal Injuries Compensation Board ex parte Moore [1999] 2 All ER 90, 446
- R v Crown Court at Sheffield ex parte Brownlow [1980] 2 All ER 444, 143
- R v Devon CC ex parte Baker [1995] 1 All ER 73, 436
- R v Disciplinary Committee of the Jockey Club ex parte the Aga Khan [1993] 2 All ER 853, 464
- R DPP ex parte Kebilene [2000] 2 AC 326, 438
- R v DPP ex parte Manning [2000] 3 WLR 463, 447
- R v East Berkshire HA ex parte Walsh [1985] QB 152, 464
- R v East Sussex CC ex parte Tandy [1998] 2 All ER 769, 419
- R v Eliot, Holles and Valentine (1629) 3 St Tr 293, 267
- R v Felixstowe Justices ex parte Leigh [1987] QB 582, 461
- R v Football Association ex parte Football League [1993] 2 All ER 833, 464
- R v Forsyth [2011] 2 AC 69, 275
- R v Frankland Prison Board of Visitors ex parte Lewis [1986] 1 All ER 272, 446
- R v Gaming Board ex parte Benaim and Khaida [1970] 2 QB 417, 435
- R v GLC, ex p Blackburn [1976] 3 All ER 184, 421
- R v Gloucestershire CC ex parte Barry [1997] 2 All ER 1, 104, 418
- R v Goldstein [1983] 1 WLR 151, 430
- R v Gough [1993] AC 646, 444
- R v Governor of Brixton Prison ex parte Armah [1968] AC 192, 412
- R v Grahame-Campbell ex parte Herbert [1935] 1 KB 594, 271
- R v Grant [2005] 3 WLR 437, 133
- R v Greenaway [1998] PL 356, 274

- R v H and C [2004] UKHL 3, 613
- R v Hammersmith and Fulham LBC ex parte Beddowes [1987] 1 ALL ER 369, 421
- R v Hampden (1637) 3 St Tr 825, 76, 121
- R v Hendon RDC ex parte Chorley [1933] 2 KB 696, 443
- R v Higher Education Funding Council ex parte Institute of Dental Surgery [1994] 1 All ER 651, 446, 447
- R v HM Treasury ex parte Smedley [1985] QB 657, 147, 359, 461
- R v Horncastle [2010] 2 AC 373, 529
- R v Horseferry Road Magistrates Court ex parte Bennett [1994] 1 All ER 289, 132
- R v Horseferry Road Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate ex parte Siadatan [1991] 1 QB 260, 597
- R v Howell [1982] QB 416, 593
- R v Hull Prison Visitors ex parte St Germain [1979] QB 425, 435
- R v Hull Prison Visitors ex parte St Germain (No 2) [1979] 1 WLR 1401, 436
- R v Immigration Appeal Tribunal ex parte Jeyeanthan [1999] 3 All ER 231, 432
- R v Inspectorate of Pollution ex parte Greenpeace (No 2) [1994] 4 All ER 329, 461
- R v International Stock Exchange of the UK and the Republic of Ireland Ltd ex parte Else (1982) Ltd [1993] 1 All ER 420, 234
- R v IRC, ex parte MFK Underwriting Agents Ltd [1990] 1 WLR 1545, 438
- R v IRC ex parte Rossminster Ltd [1980] 1 All ER 80, 621
- R v Jockey Club ex parte RAM Racecourses Ltd [1993] 2 All ER 225, 440
- R v Jones [1999] 2 Crim App Rep 253, 305
- R v Jones (Margaret) [2006] 2 WLR 772, 96, 200, 210, 468
- R v Jordan [1967] Crim LR 483, 167
- R v Khan (Sultan) [1996] 3 All ER 289, 628
- R v L [2011] EWCA Crim 65, 445
- R v Lambert [2001] 3 All ER 577, 526, 536
- R v Lancashire CC ex parte Huddleston [1986] 2 All ER 941, 447, 458
- R v Legal Aid Board ex parte Bateman [1992] 1 WLR 711, 461
- R v Lewisham LBC ex parte Shell UK Ltd [1988] 1 All ER 938, 417, 420
- R v Lichniak [2003] 1 AC 903, 468
- R v Liverpool City Council ex parte Liverpool Taxi Fleet Operators Association [1975] 1 All ER 379, 440
- R v Local Comr for Administration ex parte Bradford City Council [1979] QB 287, 478
- R v Local Comr for Administration ex parte Liverpool City Council [2001] 1 All ER 462, 478
- R v Lord Chancellor ex parte Lightfoot [2000] QB 597, 494
- R v Lord Chancellor's Dept ex parte Nangle [1992] 1 All ER 897, 371
- R v Lord Chancellor's Dept ex parte Witham [1997] 2 All ER 779, 133, 134, 411
- R v Lord Saville of Newdigate [1999] 4 All ER 860, 429
- R v Lords Comrs of the Treasury (1872) LR 7 QB 387, 321
- R v Manchester Stipendiary Magistrate, ex p Granada Television Ltd [2000] 1 All ER 135, 394
- R v Medical Appeal Tribunal ex parte Gilmore [1957] 1 QB 574, 470
- R v Metropolitan Police Comr ex parte Blackburn [1968] 2 QB 118, 106
- R v Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food ex parte Hamble Fisheries Ltd [1995] 2 All ER 714, 433, 439, 441
- R v Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food ex parte Monsanto plc [1998] 4 All ER 321, 454
- R v Ministry of Defence ex parte Smith [1996] QB 517, 347, 427, 468
- R v Ministry of Defence ex parte Walker [2000] 1 WLR 806, 439
- R v Nat Bell Liquors Ltd [1922] 2 AC 128, 412
- R v Newham LBC ex parte Begum [2000] 2 All ER 72, 419
- R v North and East Devon HA ex parte Coughlan [2000] 2 WLR 622, 440, 441, 448
- R v North Somerset DC ex parte Dixon [1998] Env LR 111, 460
- R v Northumberland Compensation Appeal Tribunal ex parte Shaw [1952] 1 KB 338, 413
- R v Officer in Charge of Police Office Castlereagh Belfast ex parte Lynch [1980] NI 126, 635
- R v Panel on Takeovers and Mergers ex parte Datafin plc [1987] QB 815, 408, 458, 463,
- R v Parliamentary Comr for Administration ex parte Balchin [1997] JPL 917, 478
- R v Parliamentary Comr for Administration ex parte Dyer [1994] 1 All ER 375, 478



- R v Parliamentary Comr for Standards ex parte Al Fayed [1998] 1 WLR 669, 274, 280
- R v Port of London Authority Ltd ex parte Kynoch [1919] 1 KB 176, 420
- R v Port Talbot BC ex parte Jones [1988] 2 All ER 207, 422, 433
- R v Preston [1993] 4 All ER 638, 95
- R v Radio Authority ex parte Bull [1997] 2 All ER 561, 428
- R v Registrar of Companies ex parte Central Bank of India [1985] 2 All ER 79, 471
- R v Rimmington [2005] UKHL 63, 127, 132
- R v Rule [1937] 2 All ER 772, 276
- R v Sargent [2003] 1 AC 347, 627, 628
- R v Secretary of State for Education ex parte Begbie [2000] 1 WLR 1115, 409, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442
- R v Secretary of State for Employment ex parte Equal Opportunities Commission [1992] 1 All ER 545, 270
- R v Secretary of State for the Environment ex parte Kirkstall Valley Campaign Ltd [1996] 3 All ER 304, 446
- R v Secretary of State for the Environment ex parte Rose Theatre Trust [1990] 1 QB 504, 460, 461
- R v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions ex parte Spath Holme Ltd [2000] 1 All ER 884, 155, 417
- R v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs ex parte Everett [1989] 1 All ER 655, 346
- R v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs ex parte Quark Fishing Ltd [2006] 1 AC 529, 3, 197, 336, 457, 530
- R v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs ex parte Rees-Mogg [1994] 1 All ER 457, 203, 226, 461
- R v Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office ex parte Indian Association of Alberta [1982] QB 892, 197
- R v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs ex parte World Development Movement Ltd [1995] 1 All ER 611, 322, 326, 416, 461
- R v Secretary of State for Health, ex parte C [2000] FLR 471, 344
- R v Secretary of State for Health, ex parte US Tobacco International Inc [1992] 1 All ER 212, 441
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Bentley [1993] 4 All ER 442, 346
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Benwell [1985] QB 554, 464
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept ex parte Cheblak [1991] 1 WLR 890, 456
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept ex parte Daly [2001] 2 AC 532, 133, 134, 428, 430
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Doody [1993] 3 All ER 92, 447
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Fayed [1997] 1 All ER 228, 435
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Fire Brigades Union [1995] 2 All ER 244, 159–60, 178, 261, 317, 322, 348, 407, 408
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Hargreaves [1997] 1 All ER 397, 441
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Hindley [2001] 1 AC 410, 420
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Khan [1985] 1 All ER 40, 438, 440
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Department ex parte Launder [1997] 1 WLR 839, 204
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept ex parte Northumbria Police Authority [1989] QB 26, 343, 347
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Oladehinde [1991] 1 AC 254, 433
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Pierson [1998] AC 539, 134, 411
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Ruddock [1987] 2 All ER 518, 347
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Simms [2000] 2 AC 115, 12, 134, 411, 526, 564, 566, 567
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Swati [1986] 1 All ER 717, 458
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept ex parte Thakrar [1974] QB 684, 191
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex parte Venables [1997] 3 All ER 97, 417
- R v Secretary of State for Social Services, ex parte Association of Metropolitan Authorities [1986] 1 WLR 1, 458
- R v Secretary of State for Social Services, ex parte Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants [1996] 4 All ER 385, 133
- R v Secretary of State for Social Services ex parte Sherwin (1996) 32 BMLR 1, 375

- R v Secretary of State for Social Services, ex parte Wellcome Foundation Ltd [1987] 2 All ER 1025, 420
- R v Secretary of State for Trade, ex parte Anderson Strathclyde plc [1983] 2 All ER 233, 275
- R v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, ex parte Greenpeace [1998] Env LR 415, 461
- R v Secretary of State for Transport, ex parte Factortame [1990] 2 AC 85, 176
- R v Secretary of State for Transport ex parte Factortame (No 2) [1991] 1 AC 603, 164, 173, 176, 237, 340
- R v Secretary of State for Transport, ex parte Factortame (No 4) [1996] QB 404, 237
- R v Secretary of State for Transport, ex parte Factortame (No 5) [2000] 1 AC 524, 237
- R v Secretary of State for Transport, ex parte Pegasus Holidays (London) Ltd [1989] 2 All ER 481, 436
- R v Secretary of State for Transport, ex parte Richmond upon Thames LBC (No 4) [1996] 4 All ER 903, 447
- R v Sefton Metropolitan BC, ex parte Help the Aged [1997] 4 All ER 532, 419
- R v Shayler [2002] 2 All ER 477, 564, 610–11
- R v Sheer Metalcraft Ltd [1954] 1 All ER 542, 146, 328
- R v Shoreditch Assessment Committee, ex parte Morgan [1910] 2 KB 859, 413
- R v Somerset CC, ex parte Fewings [1995] 1 All ER 513, 98, 129, 411, 417, 418
- R v Somerset CC, ex parte Garnett [1998] Env LR 91, 460
- R v Spear [2003] 1 AC 734, 502, 529
- R v Sussex Justices, ex parte McCarthy [1924] 1 KB 256, 443
- R v Waltham Forest LBC, ex parte Baxter [1988] QB 419, 421
- R v Waya [2013] 1 AC 294, 536
- R v West Midlands Chief Constable, ex parte Wiley [1994] 3 All ER 420, 613
- R v Wicks [1998] AC 92, 424
- R v Wilkes (1763) 95 ER 737, 84
- Rabone v Pennine Care NHS Foundation Trust [2012] 2 AC 72, 506
- Racz v Home Office [1994] 1 All ER 97, 455
- Rahmatullah v Secretary of State for Defence [2013] 1 AC 614, 209, 456
- Rantzen v Mirror Group Newspapers Ltd [1994] QB 670, 582
- Raymond v Honey [1983] 1 AC 1, 411
- Re a Complaint of Surveillance [2014] 2 All ER 576, 626, 627
- Re Clifford and O'Sullivan [1921] 2 AC 570, 631
- Redfearn v UK [2012] ECHR 1878, 47, 543
- Re Golden Chemical Products Ltd [1976] Ch 300, 433
- Re Guardian News and Media Ltd [2010] 2 All ER 799, 574
- Re Hilali [2008] 2 All ER 207, 456
- Re HK (an infant) [1967] 2 QB 617, 435
- Re JR38 [2015] 3 WLR 155, 585
- Re Medicaments and Related Classes of Goods (No 2) [2001] 1 WLR 700, 444
- Re Officer L [2007] 4 All ER 965, 448, 506
- Re Parliamentary Privileges Act 1770 [1958] AC 331, 273
- Re Racal Communications Ltd [1981] AC 374, 414
- Re S (A Child) [2004] 4 All ER 683, 576
- Reference re Amendment of the Constitution of Canada (Nos 1, 2 and 3) (1981) 125 DLR [3d] 1, 63, 65
- Reynolds v Times Newspapers Ltd [2001] 2 AC 127, 577, 580
- RFU v Consolidated Information Services [2012] 1 WLR 3333, 238
- Richardson v DPP [2014] 2 All ER 20, 598
- Ridge v Baldwin [1964] AC 40, 89, 422, 434–5, 436
- Riordan v War Office [1959] 3 All ER 552, 371
- Rivlin v Bilankin [1953] 1 QB 485, 273
- Roberts v Hopwood [1925] AC 578, 86, 411, 418
- Robinson v Secretary of State for Northern Ireland [2002] UKHL 32, 10, 56, 155, 386–7, 396
- Rogers v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [1973] AC 388, 612
- Rost v Edwards [1990] 2 All ER 641, 274
- Rowe and Davies v UK (2001) 30 EHRR 1, 613
- Rowland v Environment Agency [2004] 3 WLR 249, 438–9, 448
- Roy v Kensington, Chelsea and Westminster Family Practitioner Committee [1992] 1 AC 624, 466
- RT (Zimbabwe) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2013] 1 AC 152, 214, 565
- Runa Begum v Tower Hamlets LBC [2003] 1 All ER 731, 465, 504

- S and Marper v UK (2008) 48 EHRR 50, 511, 513, 526, 555
- S (Children) (Care Plan) [2002] 2 All ER 192, 537
- Saadi v UK (2008) 47 EHRR 17, 496
- Cases T-172/98 and 177-8/98 Salamander AG v European Parliament [2000] ECR II-2487, 233
- Salesi v Italy (1993) 26 EHRR 187, 503
- Saltpetre Case (1607) 12 Co Rep 12, 346, 631
- Sarjantson v Chief Constable of Humberside Police [2014] 1 All ER 960, 506
- Scalk and Kopf v Austria [2010] ECHR 1996, 496
- Schmidt v Secretary of State for Home Affairs [1969] 2 Ch 149, 437
- Science Research Council v Nasse [1980] AC 1028, 613
- Scoppola v Italy (No 3) (2012) 56 EHRR 663, 299
- Scott v National Trust [1998] 2 All ER 705, 463
- Scott v Phillips [1974] SLT 32, 298
- Scott v Scott [1913] AC 417, 574, 575
- Seal v Chief Constable of South Wales Police [2007] 4 All ER 177, 6, 125, 432
- Secretary of State for Education and Science v Tameside MBC [1977] AC 1014, 415, 421, 428, 430
- Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs v Assistant Deputy Coroner for North London [2013] EWHC 3724 (Admin), 622
- Secretary of State for the Home Dept v AF (No 3) [2010] 2 AC 269, 527, 616
- Secretary of State for the Home Department v CT (Vietnam) [2016] EWCA Civ 488, 219
- Secretary of State for the Home Dept v JJ [2008] 1 All ER 613, 422, 632
- Secretary of State for the Home Dept v MB [2008] 1 All ER 657, 448, 502, 523, 621
- Secretary of State for the Home Dept v Rehman [2003] 1 AC 153, 502, 554
- Case C-698/15 Secretary of State for the Home Department v Watson (21 December 2016), 629
- Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v M [2006] UKHL 11, 511, 518, 551, 552, 553, 555
- Selisto v Finland (2006) 42 EHRR 8, 569
- SerVaas Inc v Rafidain Bank [2013] 1 AC 595, 206
- Seven Bishops' Case (1688) 12 St Tr 133, 76, 79, 271, 582
- Shahid v Scottish Ministers [2015] UKSC 58, 544, 548
- Sharma v Browne-Antoine [2007] 1 WLR 780, 129
- Sheldrake v DPP [2005] 1 AC 264, 502, 634
- Sher v Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police [2011] 2 All ER 364, 466
- Shergill v Khaira [2015] AC 359, 209, 210
- Sheriff of Middlesex (1840) 11 Ad & E 273, 277
- Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2008] 3 All ER 548, 105, 344, 348, 424
- Sigurjónsson v Iceland (1993) 16 EHRR 462, 541
- Siliadin v France (2006) 43 EHRR 16, 497, 501
- Silih v Slovenia (2009) 49 EHRR 37, 510, 532
- Sim v Stretch [1936] 2 All ER 1237, 577
- Skinner v Railway Labor Executives' Association 489 US 602 (1989), 619
- Smith v East Elloe RDC [1956] AC 736, 423
- Smith v Kvaerner Cement Foundations Ltd [2006] 3 All ER 593, 443
- Smith v Ministry of Defence [2011] 1 AC 1, 210, 468, 509, 530
- Smith v Ministry of Defence [2014] AC 52, 506, 525, 527, 530, 554
- Smith and Grady v UK (2000) 29 EHRR 493, 429, 431
- Somerset v Stewart (1772) 98 ER 499, 85
- Somerville v Scottish Ministers [2007] 1 WLR 2734, 394
- South Buckinghamshire DC v Flanagan [2002] 1 WLR 2601, 421
- South Buckinghamshire DC v Porter [2004] UKHL 33, 447
- South East Asia Fire Brick Sdn Bhd v Non-Metallic Mineral Products Manufacturing Employees Union [1981] AC 363, 414
- Southwark LBC v Tanner [2001] 1 AC 1, 418
- State of Mauritius v Khoyratty [2006] 2 WLR 1330, 49
- Stefan v General Medical Council [1999] 1 WLR 1293, 446, 447
- Stockdale v Hansard (1839) 9 Ad & E 1, 166, 270, 277
- Stourton v Stourton [1963] 1 All ER 606, 268
- Straszewski v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2015] EWCA Civ 1245, 214
- Stretch v UK (2004) 38 EHRR 12, 439
- Stringer v Minister of Housing and Local Government [1971] 1 All ER 65, 421
- Stuart v Marquis of Bute (1861) 9 HL Cas 440, 393

- Sugar (Deceased) v BBC [2012] UKSC 4, 569–70, 602, 604
- Sunday Times v UK (1979–80) 2 EHRR 245, 576
- Sunday Times (No 2) v UK (1992) 14 EHRR 229, 611
- Surrey County Council v P [2014] AC 896, 491, 509, 528–9
- Tabernacle v Secretary of State for Defence [2009] EWCA Civ 23, 591
- Tariq v Home Office [2012] 1 AC 452, 501, 614, 616
- Tarsasag v Hungary (2011) 53 EHRR 3, 602
- Taylor v Lawrence [2002] 2 All ER 353, 445
- Terminiello v Chicago 337 US 1 (1949), 600
- Tesco Stores v Secretary of State for the Environment [1995] 2 All ER 636, 419
- The Christian Institute v the Lord Advocate (Scotland) [2016] UKSC 51, 545
- Thlimmenos v Greece (2000) 31 EHRR 411, 519
- Thoburn v Sunderland City Council [2002] 4 All ER 156, 4, 56, 168–9, 175, 176
- Thomas v Bridgend CBC [2012] JPL 25, 448
- Thomas v Luxembourg (2003) 36 EHRR 359, 569
- Thomas v Sawkins [1935] 2 KB 249, 593
- Thomas v Sorrell (1674) Vaughan 330, 76, 79
- Thompson and Venables v News Group Newspapers Ltd [2001] 1 All ER 908, 573
- Three Rivers DC v Bank of England (No 3) [2003] 2 AC 1, 455
- Tolstoy Miloslavsky v UK (1995) 20 EHRR 442, 582
- Tomlinson v Congleton DC [2003] 3 All ER 1122, 39
- Toussaint v A-G of St Vincent and the Grenadines [2008] 1 All ER 1, 275
- Town Investments Ltd v Dept of the Environment [1977] 1 All ER 813, 335–6, 358
- Trapp v Mackie [1979] 1 All ER 489, 143
- Trendtex Trading Corp Ltd v. Central Bank of Nigeria [1977] QB 529, 200
- Tre Tractorer Aktebolag v Sweden (1989) 13 EHRR 309, 503
- Trustees of the Dennis Rye Pension Fund v Sheffield City Council [1997] 4 All ER 747, 466
- Tsfayo v UK (2009) 48 EHRR 18, 504
- US v Brewster 408 US 501 (1972), 274
- V v UK (2000) 30 EHRR 121, 148, 575
- Van Colle v Chief Constable of Hertfordshire Police [2006] 3 All ER 963, 506
- Van de Hurk v Netherlands (1984) 18 EHRR 481, 448
- Van der Mussele v Belgium (1983) 6 EHRR 163, 501
- Case C-174/98P and C-189/98 Van der Wal v Netherlands [2000] ECR I-1, 242
- Vauxhall Estates Ltd v Liverpool Corp [1932] 1 KB 733, 168
- Vellino v Chief Constable of the Greater Manchester Police [2002] 1 WLR 218, 121
- Vintner v UK [2013] ECHR 645, 500
- Virdi v Law Society [2010] 3 All ER 653, 444, 445
- Vogt v Germany (1996) 21 EHRR 205, 557
- Von Hannover v Germany (2005) 40 EHRR 1, 511, 564
- Von Hannover v Germany (No 2) (2012) 55 EHRR 388, 584
- W (Algeria) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2012] 2 All ER 699, 125, 614, 616
- Wainwright v Home Office [2003] 4 All ER 969, 511, 583
- Walker v Baird [1892] AC 491, 212
- Wandsworth LBC v Michalak [2002] 4 All ER 1136, 518, 519
- Wandsworth LBC v Winder [1985] AC 461, 466
- Wang v Comrs of Inland Revenue [1995] 1 All ER 637, 432
- Wasif v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2016] EWCA Civ 82, 457
- Wason v Walter [1868] 4 QB 73, 277
- Watkins v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2006] 2 All ER 353, 12–13, 455
- Watkins v Woolas [2010] EWHC 2702 (QB), 308
- W(B) v M (Official Solicitor) [2011] 4 All ER 1295, 577
- Weaver v London and Quadrant Housing Trust [2009] EWCA Civ 587, 462, 463, 464, 542
- Webb v EMO Cargo (UK) Ltd [1992] 4 All ER 929, 236
- Webb v Minister of Housing and Local Government [1965] 1 WLR 755, 420
- Weller v Associated Newspapers [2016] 1 WLR 1541, 585
- West Coast Hotels v Parrish 300 US 379 (1937), 11
- Western Fish Products Ltd v Penwith DC [1981] 2 All ER 204, 421

- Westminster Corp v London and North Western Railway [1905] AC 426, 419–20
- Wheeler v Leicester City Council [1985] 2 All ER 1106, 410, 430
- White v South Yorkshire Police Authority [1999] 2 AC 455, 59
- White and Collins v Minister of Health [1939] 2 KB 838, 413
- WH Smith Do It All Ltd v Peterborough City Council [1991] 4 All ER 193, 146–7
- Wilkes v Lord Halifax (1769) 19 St Tr 1046, 85
- Wilkes v Wood (1763) 19 St Tr 1153, 85
- Wilkinson v Kitzinger [2006] EWHC 2022 (Fam), 504
- Williams v Home Office (No 1) [1981] 1 All ER 1151, 365, 613
- Wilson v First County Housing Trust [2003] 4 All ER 97, 56, 155, 275, 438, 502, 517, 526, 535, 538, 543
- Wingrove v UK (1997) 24 EHRR 1, 588
- Winspear v City Hospitals Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust [2016] 2 WLR 1089, 512
- Winterwerp v Netherlands (1979) 2 EHRR 387, 502
- Wokuri v Kassim [2012] 2 All ER 1195, 207–8
- Woolgar v Chief Constable of the Sussex Police [1999] 3 All ER 604, 611
- Case C-435/97 World Wildlife Fund for Nature v Autonome Proviz Bozen [1999] ECR I-5613, 242
- X v Bedfordshire CC [1995] 2 AC 633, 377, 455
- X v UK (1982) 4 EHRR 188, 195, 456, 497
- X and Y v Netherlands (1985) 8 EHRR 235, 498, 554
- X Ltd v Morgan Grampian Publishers Ltd [1991] 1 AC 1, 180, 574
- YL v Birmingham City Council [2007] 3 All ER 957, 462, 463–4, 541, 542
- Yeo v Times Newspapers Ltd [2015] 1 WLR 971, 582
- Young, James and Webster v UK (1982) 4 EHRR 38, 122
- Youssouf v Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures Ltd [1934] 50 TLR 581, 577
- Z v UK (2002) 34 EHRR 3, 500, 529, 540
- Zenati v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis [2015] EWCA Civ 80, 506–7
- ZH (Tanzania) v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2011] 2 AC 166, 218

# Table of legislation

- Access to Justice Act 1999, 457  
Access to Personal Files Act 1987, 608  
Act of Indemnity and Oblivion 1660, 78  
Act of Settlement 1700, 55, 57, 80, 109, 158, 286,  
292, 293, 337, 355  
Act of Supremacy 1534, 74  
Acts of Union with Wales 1536–1543, 398  
Act of Union with England 1707, 81  
Act of Union with Ireland 1800, 170  
Act of Union with Scotland 1707, 109  
Administration of Estates Act 1925, 286  
Aliens Restrictions (Amendment) Act 1917,  
589  
Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001,  
588, 621, 632, 638  
Appellate Jurisdiction Act 1876, 87
- Bank of England Acts 1946, 1964, 377  
Bank of England Act 1998, 336, 359  
Bill of Rights 1688, 55, 57, 80, 82, 96, 169, 177,  
182, 259, 268, 272, 281, 318, 320, 342, 412,  
467, 555, 567  
Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act  
2009, 190  
Bribery Act 2010, 111, 280  
British Nationality Act 1981, 189, 191, 192  
British Nationality (Falkland Islands) Act  
1983, 195  
British Nationality (Hong Kong) Act 1997, 190  
British Overseas Territories Act 2002, 195  
British Settlements Act 1837, 196  
Broadcasting Act 1990, 277  
Budget Responsibility and National Audit Act  
2011, 327
- Canada Act 1982, 169, 173  
Charities Act 2006, 45, 587  
Children Act 1989, 419, 537, 568  
Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act  
1919, 109  
Church of Scotland Act 1921, 388  
Cinemas Act 1985, 568
- Cities and Local Government Devolution Act  
2016, 105, 107, 401  
Civil Contingencies Act 2004, 262, 631, 641,  
642  
Civil List Act 1952, 338  
Civil Service (Management Functions) Act  
2002, 358  
Colonial Laws Validity Act 1865, 195  
Commissioners of Revenue and Customs Act  
2005, 603  
Communications Act 2003, 307, 308, 484, 486,  
569, 570, 586  
Constitutional Reform Act 2005, 22, 41, 56, 62,  
67, 99, 100, 101, 103, 114, 115, 117, 124, 143,  
144, 145, 151, 152, 153, 156, 157, 158, 159,  
160, 161, 162, 287, 357, 476, 479, 615  
Constitutional Reform and Governance Act  
2010, 16, 67, 95, 113, 201, 280, 281, 286, 296,  
327, 343, 345, 352, 366, 368, 369, 370, 379,  
605, 607  
Consular Relations Act 1968, 208  
Contempt of Court Act 1981, 574, 575, 576  
Corresponding Societies Act 1799, 85  
Counter-Terrorism Act 2008, 589, 632, 637, 639,  
640  
County Courts Act 1984, 159  
Courts Act 1971, 159  
Courts Act 2003, 143, 149, 157, 159  
Courts and Legal Services Act 1990, 582  
Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015, 632,  
633, 637, 639  
Crime and Courts Act 2013, 100, 103, 107, 152,  
153, 156, 157, 159, 216, 328, 453, 476, 572,  
576, 597  
Crime and Disorder Act 1998, 587, 590  
Criminal Appeals Act 1968, 101  
Criminal Appeals Act 1995, 149  
Criminal Justice Act 1988, 135, 202, 212, 492,  
500  
Criminal Justice Act 2003, 148, 459  
Crime (International Cooperation) Act 2003,  
216

- Crime and Security Act 2010, 513  
 Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015, 457, 458, 459, 461, 473  
 Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000, 148  
 Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008, 587, 588  
 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, 598  
 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, 546, 590, 592, 598  
 Criminal Law Act 1967, 630  
 Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996, 612  
 Crown and Parliament Recognition Act 1689, 80  
 Crown Proceedings Act 1947, 130, 340, 349, 358, 454  
 Crown Proceedings (Armed Forces) Act 1987, 341  
  
 Data Protection Act 1998, 355, 547, 568, 569, 605, 608  
 Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act 2014, 619, 629  
 Defamation Act 1952, 155, 277  
 Defamation Act 1996, 272, 277, 579  
 Defamation Act 2013, 577, 578, 579, 582, 583, 599, 600  
 Deregulation and Contracting Out Act 1994, 358, 433  
 Diplomatic and Consular Premises Act 1987, 208  
 Diplomatic Privileges Act 1964, 207, 208  
 Disqualifications Act 2000, 293  
  
 Education (Schools) Act 1997, 442  
 Education (No 2) Act 1986, 567, 640  
 Electoral Administration Act 2006, 292, 294, 295, 297, 298, 299, 304, 306, 307, 309  
 Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013, 260, 294, 299, 304  
 Employment Act 1988, 371  
 Employment Rights Act 1996, 371  
 Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013, 572  
 Environmental Protection Act 1990, 568  
 Equality Act 2010, 44, 520  
 European Communities Act 1972, 56, 89, 168, 169, 175, 176, 181, 202, 223, 224, 234, 235, 245, 246, 251, 252, 321, 396, 537  
 European Parliamentary Elections Act 2002, 230  
 European Union Act 2011, 171, 175, 182, 223, 241, 254  
 European Union (Amendment) Act 2008, 241  
 European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Act 2017, 223, 247  
 European Union Referendum Act 2015, 113, 244  
 Exchequer and Audit Departments Acts 1866, 1921, 320, 359  
 Extradition Act 2003, 215, 372  
  
 Finance Act 1984, 321  
 Financial Services Act 2012, 377  
 Fiscal Responsibility Act 2010, 359  
 Fixed Term Parliaments Act 2011, 56, 67, 96, 154, 260, 267, 283, 285, 296, 315, 337, 339, 345, 349, 353, 379, 391, 396  
 Football (Offences and Disorder) Act 1999, 590  
 Football (Disorder) Act 2000, 590  
 Forfeiture Act 1870, 286, 293  
 Fox's Libel Act 1792, 582  
 Freedom of Information Act 2000, 6, 16, 64, 65, 92, 95, 323, 361, 362, 366, 372, 486, 569, 603, 607, 608, 617, 618  
 Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002, 603  
  
 Gender Recognition Act 2004, 537  
 Government of Ireland Act 1914, 265  
 Government Resources and Accounts Act 2000, 359  
 Government Trading Act 1990, 322  
 Government of Wales Act 1998, 383, 398  
 Government of Wales Act 2006, 383, 385, 386, 387, 399, 400  
 Greater London Authority Act 1999, 104, 107, 301, 302, 402  
  
 Health Service Commissioners Act 1983, 355  
 Highways Act 1980, 596  
 His Majesty's Declaration of Abdication Act 1936, 337  
 Housing Act 1985, 608  
 Housing Act 1996, 465  
 Honours (Prevention of Corruption) Act 1925, 112  
 House of Commons (Administration) Act 1978, 313  
 House of Commons Commission Act 2015, 313  
 House of Commons (Disqualification) Act 1975, 150, 151, 293, 372

- House of Commons (Disqualification) Act 1978, 313
- House of Commons (Removal of Clergy Disqualification) Act 2001, 293
- House of Lords Act 1999, 56, 262, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291
- House of Lords Reform Act 2014, 263, 264, 282, 285, 286, 287, 290, 292
- House of Lords (Expulsion and Suspension) Act 2015, 282
- Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA), 11, 35, 99, 140, 143, 177, 448, 525–43, 570, 583, 589, 591, 620, 625
- Hunting Act 2004, 173, 513
- Immigration Act 1971, 192, 193, 213, 347, 372
- Immigration Act 1988, 193
- Immigration Act 2014, 190, 192, 213, 214, 217, 479, 493
- Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, 213
- Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006, 190
- Incitement to Disaffection Act 1934, 589
- Income and Corporation Taxes Act 1988, 321
- Inquiries Act 2005, 149, 280, 480, 487
- Insolvency Act 1986, 286, 293
- Intelligence Services Act 1994, 354, 622, 623, 625
- International Criminal Court Act 2001, 135, 202, 212
- International Organisations Act 1968, 208
- Investigatory Powers Act 2016, 572, 623, 624, 628, 629
- Isle of Man Act 1958, 194
- Isle of Man Purchase Act 1765, 194
- Judges' Remuneration Act 1965, 159
- Judicature Acts 1873 and 1875, 87
- Judicial Committee Act 1833, 108, 109, 294
- Judicial Pensions and Retirement Act 1993, 159
- Justice (Northern Ireland) Act 2002, 396, 397
- Justice and Security Act 2013, 615, 625
- Juries Act 1974, 51, 268
- Law Officers Act 1997, 360
- Legal Aid Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012, 152
- Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006, 145
- Life Peerages Act 1958, 56, 288, 289
- Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, 106
- Local Government Act 1972, 104, 105, 433
- Local Government Act 1974, 479
- Local Government (Contracts) Act 1997, 423
- Local Government Act 2000, 105
- Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, 608
- Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, 104, 105
- Localism Act 2011, 51, 105, 113
- Magistrates Courts Act 1980, 568
- Meeting of Parliament Act 1694, 80, 96, 259, 262
- Mental Health Act 1983, 293
- Merchant Shipping Act 1988, 176
- Ministerial and Other Salaries Acts 1975, 1997, 150
- Ministers of the Crown Act 1975, 356, 358
- Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, 536
- Modern Slavery Act 2015, 204, 501
- National Audit Act 1983, 327, 354
- National Loans Fund Act 1968, 320
- National Minimum Wages Act 1998, 354
- National Trust Act 1907, 378
- Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002, 190, 214, 215, 217
- Northern Ireland Act 1998, 56, 170, 171, 301, 383, 386, 387, 395
- Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1978, 620, 632
- Northern Ireland (Temporary Provisions) Act 1974, 632
- Northern Ireland (St Andrews Day Agreement) Acts 2006 and 2007, 396
- Obscene Publications Act 1959, 568, 586
- Official Secrets Act 1911, 609
- Official Secrets Act 1989, 371, 608, 609, 611, 617, 618
- Office of Communications Act 2002, 484, 485
- Parliament Act 1911, 66, 88, 114, 166, 173, 174, 183, 259, 263, 264, 265, 289, 291, 320
- Parliament Act 1949, 173, 174, 265, 266, 289, 291
- Parliament (Elections and Meetings) Act 1943, 262
- Parliamentary Commissioner Act 1967, 355, 477, 478
- Parliamentary Commissioner Act 1994, 477
- Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, 294, 302



- Parliamentary and Health Services  
 Commissioners Act 1987, 477
- Parliamentary Papers Act 1840, 276, 277, 567
- Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987, 278
- Parliamentary Standards Act 2009, 281
- Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011, 304
- Parliamentary Witnesses Act 1871, 326
- Peerage Act 1963, 287, 289
- Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, 470
- Police Act 1996, 106, 107, 589, 593
- Police Act 1997, 354, 627, 641
- Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, 574, 595
- Police Reform Act 2002, 107, 108
- Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, 106, 107, 593
- Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000, 51, 55, 294, 295, 296, 297, 299, 304, 305, 307
- Political Parties and Elections Act 2009, 295, 296, 306, 307
- Postal Services Act 2000, 486
- Prevention of Corruption Act 1916, 112, 280
- Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005, 632
- Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1974, 632
- Proceeds of Crime Act 2002, 536
- Prosecution of Offences Act 1985, 108, 335
- Prorogation Act 1867, 261
- Protection from Harassment Act 1997, 590, 598
- Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, 513, 627, 630, 635, 636
- Provisional Collection of Taxes Act 1968, 321
- Public Bodies Act 2011, 378
- Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, 608
- Public Bodies (Corrupt Practices) Act 1889, 111–12
- Public Order Act 1936, 590, 597
- Public Order Act 1986, 586, 588, 590, 591, 592, 596
- Public Services Ombudsman (Wales) Act 2005, 400, 479
- Racial and Religious Hatred Act 2006, 588
- Railways Act 2005, 486
- Recess Elections Act 1975, 296
- Reform Act 1832, 86
- Regency Acts 1937–53, 338
- Regulatory Reform Act 2001, 484
- Regulatory Reform Act 2006, 145, 329, 333, 484
- Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000, 372, 471, 495, 623, 641
- Regulatory Enforcement and Sanctions Act 2008, 484
- Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974, 545, 579
- Representation of the People Act 1948, 86
- Representation of the People Act 1981, 293
- Representation of the People Act 1983, 296, 305, 307, 308, 309
- Representation of the People Act 1985, 294
- Representation of the People Act 2000, 191, 294, 298, 304
- Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, 130
- Royal Assent Act 1967, 317
- Royal Marriages Act 1772, 337
- Royal Titles Act 1953, 337
- Scotland Act 1998, 158, 170, 267, 383, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392
- Scotland Act 2012, 385, 389, 390, 392, 393
- Scotland Act 2016, 67, 170, 171, 250, 385, 387, 390
- Scottish Elections (Reduction of Voting Age) Act 2015, 390
- Scottish Parliament (Constituencies) Act 2004, 391
- Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013, 315
- Security Services Act 1989, 471, 622, 623
- Security Services Act 1996, 622, 623
- Seditious Meetings Act 1817, 591
- Senior Courts Act 1981, 158, 159, 446, 453, 454, 455, 457, 458, 459, 460
- Septennial Act 1715, 259
- Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005, 590, 591, 592, 598
- Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 2000, 266
- Sovereign Grant Act 2011, 338
- Special Immigration Appeals Commission Act 1997, 213–14
- State Immunity Act 1978, 130, 205, 206, 207, 537
- Statute of Westminster 1931, 88, 170, 173
- Statutory Instruments Act 1946, 89, 146, 328
- Succession to the Crown Act 2013, 337
- Succession to the Crown Act 1707, 293
- Taking of Hostages Act 1982, 202
- Terrorism Act 2000, 495, 545, 546, 632

Terrorism Act 2006, 589, 632, 633	United Nations Act 1947, 213, 638
Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures Act 2011, 313, 632, 633, 637	Utilities Act 2000, 486
Test Act 1673, 78	Video Recordings Act 2010, 568
Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Act 2014, 112, 306	Wales Act 2014, 383, 385, 399
Transport and Works Act 1992, 318	War Crimes Act 1991, 266
Tribunals and Inquiries Acts 1958 and 1992, 89	War Damage Act 1965, 167, 631
Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act 1921, 90, 280	Welsh Church Act 1914, 109, 265
Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007, 100, 103, 452, 455, 475	Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999, 536

# The framework of the constitution



## Introduction: constitutional structures

### 1.1 The nature of the constitution: general issues

A constitution provides the governing framework of an organisation. Any organisation might have a constitution; for example, most golf clubs do so. In our case the organisation is the state. A state is a geographical territory with a government that has effective control over that area.

A constitution has three purposes: first, to enable the organisation to run effectively; second, to define the powers of those in charge of the organisation; and third, to protect members of the community against the abuse of those powers. Thus, the late Lord Bingham, a leading judge, suggested that 'any constitution, whether of a state, a trade union, a college, a club or other institution seeks to lay down and define ... the main offices in which authority is vested and the powers which may be exercised (or not exercised) by the holders of those offices' (*R v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, ex p Quark Fishing Ltd* [2006] 1 AC 529, at [12]).

Friedrich (*Limited Government* (Prentice Hall 1974) 21) displays a romantic approach to the idea of a constitution that stresses the (assumed) consent of the community: '[A] constitution is the ordering and dividing of the exercise of political power by that group in an existent community who are able to secure the consent of the community and who thereby make manifest the power of the community itself.' However, it is fanciful to assume that there is a necessary connection between the securing of power and community consent unless we consider 'consent' to include acquiescence in the sense of the absence of resistance to whoever is in power by a subservient community.

Constitutional law deals with the following matters:

- ▶ the choosing and removing of rulers;
- ▶ the relationships between the different branches of the government;
- ▶ the accountability of the government;
- ▶ the dividing up of powers geographically, for example the relationships between the central United Kingdom government and the devolved governments of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, and those between the state and overseas bodies;
- ▶ the rights of the citizen in relation to government.

There is no hard and fast distinction between constitutional law and administrative law. Administrative law deals with particular government functions such as immigration, taxation and the work of the numerous regulators, special tribunals and inquiries that decide disputes involving government action. The administrative lawyer is especially concerned to ensure that officials keep within the powers given to them.

This book does not attempt to cover administrative law comprehensively since the subject has its own separate texts. Chapters 17, 18 and 19 on judicial review of administrative action deal with the core of administrative law, which is the legal accountability of the government. Other matters relating to administrative law such as 'regulation', tribunals, public inquiries and ombudsmen are discussed in Chapter 20.

In almost all countries the constitution comprises a special document or set of documents set above the ordinary law. This is called a written constitution, a codified constitution or a Basic Law. In addition to setting out the main principles of the government structure and sometimes a list of individual rights, a written constitution may proclaim, usually in a preamble, some grand vision or moral message about the nature and purposes of the society (e.g. the US Constitution seeks to ‘secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity’). Importantly, a written constitution usually has a status superior to the rest of the law, in the sense that it can be altered only by an extraordinary procedure such as a public referendum or a special vote in the legislature, a device known as ‘entrenchment’. The courts may have the power to set aside a law that conflicts with the constitution. Such a constitution is therefore protected against manipulation by the government of the day.

The United Kingdom has no written constitution of this kind and no grand vision about the nature of its society. Our constitution, such as it is, is composed of numerous ordinary laws and other rules and practices which have emerged over many centuries to deal with particular issues. Both in its legal and its political aspects, the constitution relies on precedent in the sense of appealing to past decisions and practices. Its *legal* principles and rules, if written down at all, are to be found in the same documents as the sources of any law, namely:

- ▶ Acts of Parliament (statutes) passed by Parliament at the instigation of the regime in power at the time. Thus constitutional statutes are scattered throughout the centuries, each dealing with a particular concern of the day (for examples see Section 3.2). The constitution also evolves through the accumulation of many pieces of detailed legislation about particular topics, for example, electoral law.
- ▶ Cases decided by the courts (common law). Again these are scattered, dealing with specific matters and focusing narrowly on individual disputes which can arise in many and various contexts. The constitution therefore has to be pieced together by imaginative interpretation of a vast heap of particular rules and decisions.

Rules from these two sources are set out and can be changed in the same way as any other law. In other words they are constitutional only because of the matters they deal with. How do we know what counts as constitutional? The question arises mainly because constitutional matters are sometimes given special treatment (see Section 8.4.3). Any guidance can only be vague and general. For example, Laws LJ said that a matter is constitutional if it ‘conditions the legal relationships between citizen and state in some general overarching manner, or enlarges or diminishes the scope of what are now regarded as fundamental rights’ (*Thoburn v Sunderland City Council* [2002] 4 All ER 156, [62]–[64]).

Craig ([2014] PL 373, 389) refers to horizontal, territorial and vertical dimensions of constitutions. Horizontally, a constitution sets up the main organs of government and distributes their powers; territorially, it divides powers geographically; and vertically, it governs the relationship between citizen and state. However, as Craig points out, a constitutional rule must also be especially important, thus introducing a vague subjective element (how do we define what is ‘especially important?’) (see e.g. Section 1.4.1 Box).

The United Kingdom is probably unique in not having any written constitution. New Zealand is also said to have an unwritten constitution, but the New Zealand

Constitution Act 1986, although it is an ordinary statute, sets out the basic structure of its government. Israel is said to have no written constitution, but has an organised collection of legislation recognised as constitutional by the Supreme Court. The constitution of Saudi Arabia is the Koran.

It is sometimes said that our constitution is 'part written'. While literally correct – in that our constitutional laws are written down in the same way as any other laws – this description seems unhelpful since it ignores the fact that we have no special constitutional document with a higher status than other laws.

There are also many rules, practices and customs which are not 'law' at all. They get their force only because they are consistently obeyed as established practices. The most important of these are known as 'constitutional conventions'. Many basic constitutional arrangements rely on conventions; for example, the selection of, and most of the powers of, the prime minister. Unlike laws, conventions are not directly enforced by the courts (Section 3.4.4). Some, although not all, are also unwritten.

There is no authority empowered to determine whether a convention exists and what it means. This depends entirely on general acceptance by the politicians and officials who run the government and those from whom they choose to take advice. There is no shortage of people who wish to give their opinions on constitutional matters and it is easy for the constitution to be influenced by networks of people having personal connections with those in power. Thus, Hennessy ((1995) 15–30) describes the UK Constitution as generated by a circle of 'insiders' comprising senior officials, their friends and their academic and professional acolytes. He recounts the Victorian conceit that conventions embody 'the general agreement of public men' about 'the rules of the game' ((1995) 36, 37).

Our constitution is often described as 'organic', meaning that it develops naturally in the light of changing circumstances. We should not therefore expect the constitution to be straightforward and logical. It is a product of historical development and practical compromises generated by rival groups of power-hungry persons. In another metaphor, the common law UK Constitution is sometimes compared to a ramshackle old house under constant repair and renovation and made of numerous bits and pieces. It has also been compared, with the implication that it is 'sound and lasting', to the work of bees making a honeycomb (see *Jackson v Attorney General* [2006] 1 AC 262, at [125] (Lord Hope)). Thus constitutional change may be disguised under the cloak of continuity, taking place in relatively small steps, in the interests of those in power at the time, without adequate scrutiny, and perhaps eventually changing the nature of the 'house'. Consider, for example, the progress of devolution of powers to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and the series of anti-terrorism measures introduced in recent years.

It has often been suggested that we do not have a constitution in any meaningful sense. The democratic activist Thomas Paine (1737–1809) labelled the British government as 'power without right'. In *The Rights of Man*, Paine asserted that without a written constitution authorised directly by the people there was no valid constitution (first published 1791, ed. Foot and Kramnick (Penguin 1987) 220–21, 285–96). Similarly, Ridley (1988) claims that the United Kingdom has no constitution since he believes that constitutions must be superior to the government of the day and not changeable by it. The UK seems to fail this test. Insofar as any rules have a special status, this is based on no more than self-restraint founded upon respect for principles that are regarded by those in power as fundamental or 'constitutional'.

### 1.1.1 Constitutionalism

However, whether or not we have a constitution in a strict sense, the term ‘constitutionalism’ applies to the UK as a widely shared belief in favour of limited and accountable government. It includes the rule of law, which requires limits on government policed by independent courts, and ‘responsible government’, which requires government officials to be accountable for their actions to an institution representing the people.

Constitutionalism also favours separation of powers between different governmental organs. For example, in *R (Evans) v Attorney General* [2015] UKSC 21, the Supreme Court was highly critical of the statutory power of the executive to veto a tribunal decision to require publication under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (Section 24.2.1). This was described by Judge LJ in the High Court as a constitutional aberration ([2013] EWHC 1960 (Admin), at [1]).

It requires openness in government decision-making and open justice in the courts (*A v BBC* [2014] 2 All ER 1037, [27]). It also includes the protection of rights such as access to the courts and freedom of expression, described as inherent and fundamental to democratic civilised society (see Baroness Hale in *Seal v Chief Constable of South Wales Police* [2007] 4 All ER 177, at [38]–[40]).

### 1.2 The foundations of a constitution

A constitution can, of course, adopt any form of government. The most widely accepted explanation of the foundations of a constitution is a ‘positivist’ one. According to this theory, a constitution is valid or ‘legitimate’ if enough of the people whom it concerns, both officials and the public, accept it so as to make it broadly effective, irrespective of the motivations for such acceptance. Thus the foundations of the law depend on a political state of affairs. UK law takes this pragmatic view in the context, for example, of recognising the legality of a rebellion (see *Madzimbamuto v Lardner-Burke* [1969] 1 AC 645: takeover of a British colony by a group of white settlers held not valid because they were not yet fully in control).

‘Legitimacy’ might also refer to an external standard that can be used to assess the constitution. The problem here of course is to identify what this external standard is. Lawyers, for example, might refer to ‘the rule of law’, meaning widely accepted but vague values, such as justice, as identified by themselves. Related to this are ‘natural law’ theories in which a constitution is valid only if it conforms to a set of objective moral principles. Apart from the question of who determines what these principles are, it may be preferable to treat moral principles as a standpoint for critiquing a constitution and proposing changes to it, rather than confusing this with questions of its legal validity.

### 1.3 Basic constitutional concepts

Three related ideas have dominated many modern constitutions, including our own. These are ‘sovereignty’, the rule of law, and the separation of powers. Sovereignty means ultimate power without limit. Some, such as Hobbes (Section 2.3.1), argue that there must always be a ‘sovereign’ capable of having the last word in any conceivable



dispute, particularly in an emergency. In any constitution it might be difficult to locate sovereignty since government power is usually divided up. The sovereign need not be a single person: if it is not, rules are needed to ensure that its components can reach agreement. This raises problems as to whether the sovereign can change those rules and, if not, who can? In an extreme emergency, such as a threat of immediate attack, sovereign power might be exercised by a single person.

In the United Kingdom, the conventional view is that the sovereign is Parliament, as a combination of the monarch, the House of Lords and the House of Commons. However, the legal sovereign is not necessarily the political sovereign. For example, although Parliament has legal power to make any law, politically it is unlikely to be able to make a law to which the international money markets would seriously object.

The primary meaning of the rule of law is relatively uncontroversial – namely, that it is desirable to have rules known in advance which are binding on government and governed alike. This helps the organisation to run effectively by keeping order and producing certainty. However, this formal meaning of the expression ‘rule of law’ ignores the content of the rules themselves, whether they are morally good or bad, and the question of who makes them. For example, a concentration camp might be subject to the rule of law in this sense. A wider or ‘substantive’ version of the rule of law (Section 6.3) invokes certain moral and political ideas which are claimed to be especially associated with law. These include above all the notion of open justice policed by independent courts resisting the natural tendency of government towards secrecy (Section 23.3.4).

The separation of powers requires that government be divided up into different branches of equal status and importance. From both a political and a legal perspective this is to prevent any one branch of government having dominant power. Each branch can restrain the others since any major decision would require the cooperation of all branches. Governments usually comprise three primary branches. The legislature is the primary lawmaker, the judiciary settles disputes about the meaning and application of the law, and the executive carries out all the other government functions, implementing and enforcing the law. The difference between the three functions is hazy at the edges, but the basis of them is widely recognised. In contemporary society the executive is likely to be the most powerful branch because it controls the resources, both physical and financial, of the state. Crucially, it is the executive that proposes most new laws to the legislature and appoints to the most important public jobs. Different countries have reached different conclusions as to the extent of the separation of powers since there is a trade-off between the interests of government efficiency (which points away from a separation) and the desire to prevent abuse of power. For example, the United States has a strict separation, but in the United Kingdom separation is more limited. In the United States, a member of the executive headed by the president cannot be a member of the legislature, but in the UK, ministers who head the executive must (by convention) be Members of Parliament (MPs). We seem to prefer strong government to limited government.

Some constitutions make grandiose claims to shared ideals and purposes. For example, the Constitution of Ireland refers to ‘seeking to promote the common good with due observance of Prudence, Justice and Charity so that the dignity and freedom of the individual may be assured, true social order attained, the unity of our country restored and concord established with other nations’ (Preamble). The French Constitution

famously refers to 'the Rights of Man' and the 'equality and solidity of the peoples who compose [the Republic]' (Art 1). The UK Constitution makes no such claims, at least explicitly.

Many constitutions contain a list of basic rights of the citizen; those of Germany and the USA are prominent examples. These rights vary, reflecting the political culture of the state in question. Constitutions also vary in the extent to which the courts may police these rights. In the family of liberal democratic states to which the United Kingdom belongs, these rights are primarily 'negative' rights in the sense of rights not to be interfered with by the state. They include the right to life, the right to personal freedom, the right to a fair trial, the right to privacy and family life, the right to freedom of expression, the right to assembly and association, the right to freedom of religion and the right to protection for property. 'Positive rights', such as those to housing and medical care, might be regarded as equally important, but because these require hard political choices between priorities and large-scale public expenditure they are generally regarded in the UK as matters for the ordinary political process rather than as firm legal rights. Enforcement by a court would be practically impossible. Nevertheless, positive rights appear in many constitutions, for example those of Poland, Portugal and South Africa. Some constitutions, for example that of Switzerland, also impose particular duties on citizens, such as military service and voting.

#### 1.4 Written and unwritten constitutions: advantages and disadvantages

As we have seen, the constitutions of most countries are set out in a single document or related group of documents. These are generally superior to all other kinds of law in that laws which conflict with the constitution can be struck down by the courts. They also often contain entrenched provisions that protect the constitution from being changed by the government of the day, for example a referendum of the people or a two-thirds majority of the lawmaking assembly.

Even a written constitution will not include all the rules needed for governing the country. The precise contents vary considerably between different states. For example, the methods of voting are important by any democratic standards, but they do not feature in many constitutions other than as general requirements of fairness and equality. Some constitutions, such as that of the United States, are relatively short and expressed in general terms. Others, like that of Portugal, run to hundreds of detailed pages.

##### 1.4.1 The merits of a written constitution

There is no consensus as to whether it is preferable to have a written constitution, although proposals to create one are regularly heard. The main purpose of a written constitution seems to be to usher in a new regime or to signify a 'constitutional moment' or change of direction for a state as a result of revolution, grants of independence or domestic catastrophe. The device of a written constitution became widely used for these purposes from the late eighteenth century.

Since the late seventeenth century, the United Kingdom has not experienced such a constitutional moment. Constitutional changes have been gradual and evolutionary and the seventeenth-century 'constitutional moment' involved the assertion of

an all-powerful Parliament, so making a written constitution pointless at the time (Section 4.5.1).

To mark the 800th anniversary of the Magna Carta, the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee of the House of Commons engaged in an extensive consultation as to whether the UK should have a written constitution, and what it should look like. While it acknowledged that the initiative for codifying constitutional rules should come from the executive branch, the Committee tentatively supported the creation of a written constitution on the basis that ‘the public is entitled to know the processes by which it is governed and the fundamental rules on which the constitution is based’ (HC 2014–15, 599, [58]): to which end it produced its own draft accessible summary constitution, with options for reform (*ibid.*, Annex A). In its original consultation document (HC 2014–15, 463), the Committee set out the main advantages and disadvantages of adopting a written constitution as follows:

#### *Advantages*

- ▶ **Publicity and accessibility:** matters of such importance should be codified for all to see and understand.
- ▶ **Democracy:** the present unwritten rules are controlled by the elite and were appropriate to the deferential and class-ridden society of the past but not to today’s more equal society. Constitutional changes can now be pushed through by governing parties to benefit themselves. Entrenched procedures that ensure parliamentary and popular support for constitutional changes are desirable.
- ▶ **Sovereignty:** the current fundamental principle that Parliament is supreme is unsuited to a modern democratic society in which the people should be sovereign. The people should therefore have a role in deciding what the constitution should include.
- ▶ **Education:** the absence of constitutional teaching in our schools makes it all the more important to have a single document. This would have great symbolic importance.
- ▶ **Certainty:** some of our unwritten constitution is highly uncertain and some of its rules existing outside the law have dubious status. The uncertainty over the question of whether Parliament is sovereign (Section 8.5) is a conspicuous example, as is the question of the status of constitutional conventions (Section 3.4).
- ▶ **Value:** the special nature of constitutional principles makes it desirable to distinguish them from ordinary law. Thus in *Cullen v Chief Constable of the RUC* [2004] 2 All ER 237, at [46], Lord Hutton referred to a right which a democratic assembly representing the people has enshrined in a written constitution, the written constitution being ‘clear testimony that an added value is attached to the protection of that right’. An example of the risks inherent in our unwritten constitution is the creeping erosion of individual freedom when restrictive legislation is continually added to (e.g. Sections 23.7 and Chapter 25).
- ▶ **Protecting weaker arms of government:** parliamentary supremacy means that local government is not protected against central government other than by political influences. The devolved governments of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are also relatively unprotected. A written constitution would protect local government and also strengthen the separation of powers between the three branches of government whereas, at present, the executive dominates.

- ▶ National identity: a written constitution becomes a symbol of national identity and national pride (as in the USA, but not universally true).
- ▶ Coordination: constitutional reforms in the unwritten constitution are uncoordinated.
- ▶ Modernisation: 'The present "unwritten" constitution is an anachronism riddled with references to the past and unsuited to the social and political democracy of the 21st Century.'

### *Disadvantages*

- ▶ It is 'unnecessary' because our constitution has proved stable and successful without the revolutionary 'constitutional moment' that calls for a written constitution (above). It might be, however, that current political agitation concerning claims to transfer power away from the central government to the regions (notably Scotland, notwithstanding the outcome of the referendum on independence in September 2014), coupled with the divisions and uncertainties caused by the popular vote to leave the European Union in June 2016, amount to such a 'moment'.
- ▶ It is flexible and evolutionary so as to respond to changing circumstances, enabling practical problems to be dealt with as they arise; (see Lord Bingham in *Robinson v Secretary of State for Northern Ireland* [2002] UKHL 32, at [12]). This might be regarded as not wholly desirable depending on who deals with the problems.
- ▶ It reflects our 'British' character (although the committee does not say what this is: possibly deference to a ruling elite).
- ▶ It enables decisions to be made by elected politicians rather than unelected judges. A written constitution would politicise the judiciary by requiring it to pass judgment on legislation and would increase politically motivated litigation and expand judicial review of government action. (This is sometimes also claimed as an advantage of a written constitution.)
- ▶ There is already a wide range of pressures on ministers which serve as controls on their actions, decisions and policies. These include the opposition in Parliament, party backbenchers, departmental select committees, the House of Lords, the EU, the devolved governments, the media and the voter. (Objectors might claim that these are significantly weak.)
- ▶ The unwritten constitution enables the executive to act quickly and flexibly 'to meet citizens' needs' (or to protect itself against criticism).
- ▶ A written constitution would diminish the significance of the monarchy (arguably desirable).
- ▶ There are so many practical problems in deciding what to put into a written constitution that it is not worth bothering to do so since the matter is of low priority, carries little popular support and risks distracting and destabilising the country.

A written constitution will almost certainly be drafted in vague general language which must be interpreted in the light of the politics of the day and will thus change its meaning from time to time, allowing judges considerable freedom in applying it. For example, in *Plessy v Ferguson* 163 US 537 (1896), the US Supreme Court held that racial segregation was constitutional under the 14th Amendment of the Constitution ('equal protection of the law') and in *Brown v Board of Education* 347 US 483 (1954) that it was

not. Similarly, in *Lochner v New York* 198 US 45 (1905) the Supreme Court held that it was unconstitutional under the same provision for the law to regulate the relations between employer and employee, but in *West Coast Hotels v Parrish* 300 US 379 (1937), at a time of depression, the court upheld a law protecting women's wages.

However, because judges take differing approaches to interpreting the law, it is sometimes said that a written constitution could also encourage the use of abstract, linguistic, legalistic techniques at the expense of the underlying political realities and human concerns. In the United States there is continuing debate as to whether the constitution should be interpreted in the light of changing values, or restricted to the inferred intentions of its eighteenth-century founders. The 'right to keep and bear arms' in the Second Amendment is a particular, and hugely controversial, focus for this (see e.g. *McDonald v Chicago* 561 US 742 (2010)). Closer to home, the notion that the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) is a 'living instrument' that can be interpreted flexibly has caused resentment in some UK political circles and seems likely to result in future repeal of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA), which gives the convention effect in domestic law (Section 22.10).

A possible advantage of a written constitution is that it encourages a rationalistic process of constitutional design which ideally creates a constitution as a logical scheme in which inequality is relatively difficult to engineer. On the other hand, it can be argued that, in a matter as large and as open to disagreement as a constitution, human beings are not capable of sensible grand designs and that the flexible trial and error approach favoured in the United Kingdom is preferable. Edmund Burke (1729–97), a prominent parliamentarian and conservative thinker, claimed that the constitution has special status by virtue of its being rooted in long-standing custom and tradition. Burke regarded attempts to engineer constitutions on the basis of abstract reason as ultimately leading to tyranny. This is because he believed that humans, with their limited understanding and knowledge, are inevitably at the mercy of unforeseen events, and that reasoning based on abstract general principles, by trying to squeeze us into rigid templates, is a potential instrument of oppression:

The age of chivalry is gone ... That of sophisters, economists and calculators has succeeded; and the glory of Europe is extinguished for ever. (Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790))

It is also argued, from a somewhat sanctimonious perspective, that the United Kingdom does not need a 'paper constitution' because our constitutional values such as individual rights are entrenched in the culture of the community itself and so support peace and stability. The fact that the United Kingdom invariably imposed written constitutions on its colonial territories was explained on the basis of their supposed immaturity. This attitude was influenced by the experience of the many revolutions in continental Europe during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, most importantly the French Revolution and its series of regime changes from 1789 onwards. The then novel notion of a written constitution was associated with bloodshed, chaos and radical propaganda. For example, it was claimed in the House of Commons that 'we owe our superiority, in a great measure, to the freedom of our government and the blessings of our constitution' (HC Deb 8 November 1814, vol 29, col 39). Furthermore, Dicey, a leading jurist of the Victorian era whose analysis of the constitution has (as we will see) proved highly influential, thought it an advantage that

much of our constitution is embedded in the fabric of the common law made by the courts which gets its strength from practical issues generated from below rather than being imposed from above in a document that can be torn up at the whim of a transient political majority in Parliament.

However, there does not seem to be hard evidence that the relative stability of the United Kingdom was due to our unwritten constitution as opposed to political and economic factors – not least the prosperity exacted from the British Empire of the nineteenth century and the ability of the ruling aristocracy to manage dissent by a mixture of repression and rewards (Sections 4.6 and 4.7). Conversely, the record of countries with written constitutions is mixed. The original US Constitution of 1788 has survived until the present day although it has been amended sparingly from time to time. Argentina (1853), Belgium (1831), Luxembourg (1868) and Tonga (1875) have long-standing constitutions, but the first two have not had particularly stable governments. Switzerland is a highly stable country, but its constitution (most recent 1999) has been changed many times. Whether a regime is stable and whether a constitution is easily changed may well depend more on cultural and political factors rather than legal devices.

Moreover, it is questionable whether an unwritten constitution can meet all the problems of today. Firstly, the population is much larger and more diverse (ethnically, religiously, culturally) than was the case for much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when, although democracy was increasing, most political influence lay with native-born male property owners with strong common interests. Secondly, it is not obvious that an unwritten constitution meets the needs of what is often called our ‘multi-layered’ constitution where important powers are exercised by supranational bodies such as the European Union (EU) and by the devolved bodies in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland as well as by the traditional Parliament and courts. Coordination between these bodies is important. These matters may call for clearer principles than are possible with an unwritten constitution.

Even in the absence of a written constitution, there are devices within UK law capable of limiting the ability of governments to make constitutional changes.

- ▶ It is arguable that a statute could ‘entrench’ a special rule by providing that the rule could be changed only by a special process such as a referendum (Section 8.5.3).
- ▶ The courts may give special weight and ‘close scrutiny’ to matters that they regard as constitutional (*R (Evans) v Attorney General* [2014] EWCA Civ 254: executive veto over court decision (Section 24.2.1)). It has been suggested that certain statutes are ‘constitutional statutes’ and that certain rights, such as freedom of speech, are constitutional rights that require the lawmaker to use very clear language to repeal or override (Sections 6.6 and 8.4.3). In *R v Secretary of State for the Home Dept, ex p Simms* [2000] 2 AC 115, at 131 (right of a prisoner of access to the press), Lord Hoffmann stated that we apply ‘principles of constitutionality little different from those which exist in countries where the power of the legislature is expressly limited by a constitutional document’. Lord Steyn has remarked that to classify a right as constitutional strengthens its value in that the court is virtually always required to protect it (quoted by Cooke, ‘The Road Ahead in the Common Law’, in Andenas and Fairgrieve (2009) 691).
- ▶ However, there may be disagreement as to what statutes or rights are ‘constitutional’. Thus, in *Watkins v Secretary of State for the Home Dept* [2006] 2 All ER 353 (a prisoner’s

access to a lawyer), the House of Lords held that, in the absence of a written constitution, the notion of a constitutional right is too vague. (See also *A-G v National Assembly for Wales Commission* [2013] 1 AC 792, at [80]: too uncertain.) In *R (Chester) v Secretary of State for Justice* [2014] 1 All ER 683, at [35], [137], the Supreme Court held that the question of voting rights was not a fundamental feature of UK law.

- ▶ It has even been suggested that the courts could refuse to apply a statute that violates a fundamental constitutional principle (Section 8.5.6).
- ▶ The House of Lords Constitution Committee examines the constitutional aspects of bills and reviews constitutional developments (see HL 2001–02, 11; see Caird [2012] PL 4). The House of Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee considers general questions of constitutional reform.
- ▶ Proposed legislation that Parliament regards as ‘of first-class constitutional importance’ is examined by a committee of the whole House rather than by the normal ‘standing committee’ (Section 13.3.1).
- ▶ There is authority that compensation can be awarded against a public official who violates a ‘constitutional right’ even where no loss or damage has occurred (*Ashby v White* (1703) 2 Lord Raym 938: right to vote).

The argument about a written constitution therefore reflects deeper disagreements about whether public officials can be trusted and whether democracy should be the ultimate principle of our society (Section 2.8). On balance, it may well be that contemporary changes in political society and institutional arrangements in recent years, coupled with a governmental system about which there is often considerable popular scepticism and disenchantment, make it desirable to make a break with the past and to establish a written constitution using a method that ensures the collaboration of the whole community.

## 1.5 The legal and the political constitution

Constitutional law depends heavily on its political context. Thus, the late Professor Griffith famously described the UK Constitution as a ‘political constitution’. He remarked that ‘the constitution of the United Kingdom lives on, changing from day to day for the constitution is no more and no less than what happens. Everything that happens is constitutional. And if nothing happened that would be constitutional also’ ((1979) 19). Griffith seems to have meant that the constitution is the ever-changing interaction of the formal rules and the persons who interpret and operate them from time to time, all of whom have their own attitudes and prejudices.

Although our primary concern in this book is with law it is therefore necessary to relate this to its political context. For the purposes of studying constitutional law, it is useful to attempt to distinguish between law and politics.

Unfortunately, there is no agreed meaning of ‘politics’ or of ‘law’. For now it is enough to say that ‘law’ means rules, principles and standards that are enforced ultimately by the physical force of the state and, in our case, policed by independent courts. Laws are recognised solely because they are made by designated procedures (in the UK by the courts and Parliament). In a broad sense, ‘politics’ means the struggle for power between different interest groups, and in this sense law is a distinctive aspect of

politics in that it depends on, and is influenced by, political forces, and there is potential for conflict between the courts and the other branches of government.

Law can be distinguished from other aspects of politics in at least the following respects:

- ▶ It relies on impersonal and usually written sources of authority in the form of binding general rules.
- ▶ It emphasises the desirability of certainty, coherence and impartial and independent public procedures such as courts for settling disputes.
- ▶ Politics is concerned primarily with outcomes, for which law is only one among several instruments, and is more willing than law to use emotions, personal relationships, rewards and compromises in order to achieve those outcomes.

A useful way of framing the political context is the metaphor derived from Harlow and Rawlings (2009), of 'red light' and 'green light' theories. Red lighters emphasise the role of law as controlling government in the interests of individual rights and the protection of autonomy. Green lighters favour the collective goals of society, which they believe are best carried out by the government through democratic mechanisms. They therefore see the role of law as being primarily to enable government to effectively achieve important public goals, such as education, health care and social welfare. Green light theory does not of course deny the importance of the individual, but emphasises collective and community means of protecting the individual and of preventing the abuse of government power. However, in reality, the approach taken by the law might be seen as a form of compromise or, in Harlow and Rawlings's terms, 'amber light'.

The legal and the political constitution are interrelated in various ways. For example:

- ▶ Politics provides the purposes and values that underpin the constitution and give the law its content.
- ▶ Law operates as a delivery mechanism for particular political policies written into legislation.
- ▶ The accountability of government – constitutionalism – is both legal and political and each acknowledges the other (e.g. Section 18.1). There is legal accountability to the courts through the courts' powers of judicial review of government decisions to ensure that they comply with the law. There is political accountability to Parliament in the form of the concept of 'responsible government', which requires the government to justify its actions to Parliament. However, for several reasons, including the domination of Parliament by the executive and limited resources, political accountability is weak. Other than the right to vote periodically for individual MPs there is no direct accountability to the people.
- ▶ Conversely, values especially concerned with the legal process in the courts, which can be summarised as fairness and justice, feed into the political process. For example, how far should anti-terrorist policies be subject to the right to a fair trial (Section 24.6)?
- ▶ Within the law itself there is disagreement between different judges and groups of lawyers about political values. Because the limits of human competence mean that rules can never be entirely clear or complete, judges may be unconsciously



influenced by their political beliefs in deciding between competing arguments. The best we can expect is an open and self-aware mind. Endless disagreement underlies both law and politics, and dissents are commonplace in judicial decisions. This is one reason why a diverse judiciary may be desirable.

- Politics determines the actual power relationship between the different branches of government: lawmaker, executive, judges, military and so on. For example, even if in law Parliament as the lawmaker is supreme, if MPs are weak, self-seeking and subservient the executive is likely to be dominant.

Griffith's view was that constitutional decisions should be (and, traditionally, were) made by political actors rather than unelected judges, and that political means of holding government to account (e.g. through a duty placed upon ministers to explain their actions and decisions in Parliament) were preferable to accountability through the courts. He took this view because he regarded these actors and mechanisms as inherently more democratic, and also because he felt that the judiciary was more liable to be susceptible to implicit political bias (of a right-wing character) as a consequence of its class and educational background. However, there has been a perceptible trend towards a legal constitution in recent years. The growth of judicial review, coupled with the enactment of the HRA (Chapters 17–19 and 22) and the impact of the law of the European Union (Chapter 10), has meant that legal mechanisms are now much more frequently invoked in order to render government accountable in the UK than was the case half a century or so ago.

## 1.6 The dignified and efficient constitution: deceiving the people?

It is often said that the glue that holds the unwritten UK Constitution together is the propensity of the British people to subservience and deference to officialdom. Writing in the mid-nineteenth century, Walter Bagehot ((1902) see Preface) regarded social class deference and superstition as the 'magic' ingredients that animated the constitution. Bagehot had a pessimistic view of the political sophistication of ordinary people and thought that government could only work effectively if its authority was buttressed by traditional institutions which commanded people's imagination and made them deferential to the rulers.

Bagehot distinguished between what he called the 'dignified' and the 'efficient' parts of the constitution. The dignified parts give the constitution its authority and encourage people to obey it. They involve the trappings of power, notably the monarchy that underpins the central government (Section 14.6) and the mystique of ceremony and ritual. Bagehot thought that it would be dangerous to shed the light of reality upon the monarchy since doing so would expose it as a sham. The efficient part of the constitution, which Bagehot located primarily in the Cabinet (although today this is less convincing, Section 15.4), carries out the working exercise of power behind the scenes. The distinction between the dignified and the efficient performs a useful function in a democracy by preventing working politicians from claiming to embody the state, a technique adopted by tyrants throughout history. For example, the monarch and Parliament have authority, the latter because it is elected, while the government has power without authority in its own right. It gets its authority only from Parliament.

On the other hand, the dignified element can reinforce tyranny by hiding reality. The 'noble lie' postulated by Plato in his *Republic* is designed to keep people happy with their designated roles: when humans were formed in the earth the rulers had gold mixed with them, the military silver and the workers lead. Even Plato's pupils found this hard to swallow, but they considered that it is sometimes right to lie in the interests of the state. There is similar thinking evident today. In *McIlkenny v Chief Constable of the West Midlands Police* [1980] 2 All ER 227, at 239–40, Lord Denning MR took the view that it was better for the 'Birmingham Six' to remain wrongly convicted than to face the 'appalling vista' of the police being found to be guilty of perjury, violence and threats. The Scott Report into the sale of arms to Iraq (*Report of the Inquiry into the Export of Defence Equipment and Dual Use Goods to Iraq and Related Prosecution* (HC 1995–96, 115)) revealed that ministers and civil servants regarded it as being in the public interest to mislead Parliament, if not actually to lie, over government involvement in arms sales to overseas regimes. The Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 prevents disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 of all correspondence between the Prince of Wales and ministers on the ground that it would weaken public confidence in the monarchy if people knew that the heir to the throne attempted to influence government (Section 24.2.1).

## 1.7 Types of constitution

There are several traditional ways of classifying constitutions. It must be emphasised that these are ideals or models and there is no reason to assume that any particular constitution fits neatly within any single category. The types are:

**Federal and unitary.** In a federal state (such as the USA, Germany or Canada) the various powers of government are divided between different geographical units and a central government. Each level is equal and independent and can exercise the powers given to it without the interference of the other level. In a unitary state, ultimate power is held by a single central government although there may be subordinate units of local government with powers given and taken away by the centre. In law, the United Kingdom is strictly a unitary state with the central authority, Parliament, having absolute power.

How powers are allocated within a federation varies according to the history and political concerns of the state in question. There is usually a single citizenship of the central state which is the internationally recognised entity. The federal government is usually responsible for foreign affairs, defence and major economic matters, while private law is usually the responsibility of the states. Criminal offences, social regulation and public services may be allocated to either level. Usually particular matters are given to the federal level, with the residue left with the states: the 'reserved powers' model. Switzerland provides an extreme example where the powers of the federal government are severely limited in favour of the autonomy of the cantons. The converse 'conferred powers' model is less common (e.g. Canada). The relative political power of each level depends on the circumstances of each country and cannot necessarily be discovered from the law itself.

There may be demarcation problems to be resolved by the courts, so federal constitutions have a strong legalistic element. Each level might have its own courts, although in Germany, for example, there is a single court system. (In civil law countries such as

Germany where the law, being codified, is more uniform, there may be less need for separate courts at each level than in a common law country such as the USA.)

Federalism is practicable where the component units have enough in common economically and culturally to enable them to cooperate, while at the same time each unit is sufficiently distinctive to constitute a community in its own right but not sufficiently powerful to aspire to a role on the international stage. Thus, a delicate balance must be struck. The United States and Australia are relatively successful federations, whereas Canada with its split between English-speaking and French-speaking regions has sometimes been less stable. Yugoslavia, with its many ethnic tensions, was tragically unsuccessful once Soviet control was removed.

Dicey ((1915) 171) strongly opposed federalism, claiming that it tends towards conservatism, creates divided loyalties and elevates legalism to a primary value, making the courts the pivot on which the constitution turns and perhaps threatening their independence.

In 1973, the Royal Commission on the Constitution (Cmnd 5460) argued against a federal constitution for the United Kingdom. It argued firstly that there would be a lack of balance since the units are widely different in economic terms, with England being dominant since it includes about 84 per cent of the population of the UK. There is a need for central and flexible economic management since the resources of the United Kingdom are unevenly distributed geographically, with much of the UK comprising thinly populated hills. Secondly, echoing Dicey, the Commission argued that a federal regime would be contrary to our constitutional traditions in that it would elevate the courts over political machinery. It may be best to think of federalism as a loose notion, a matter of degree comprising a range of relationships, rather than as a simple uniform model. From this perspective the United Kingdom may be regarded as a state with certain federal features. In particular, EU membership (for the present) has arguably introduced a federal element (Section 10.4). The devolved governments for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland within the United Kingdom are not strictly federal but in some respects have political and legal protection akin to federalism (Section 16.1). From the strictly legal perspective, the principle that Parliament is sovereign preserves the unitary nature of the constitution. However, the Scottish referendum of 2014 revealed considerable tension within the devolved structure not least because of the anomalous position of England, which lacks its own powers or legislative assembly (Section 16.6). That tension seems set to persist as two of the constituent parts of the UK (Scotland and Northern Ireland) voted to remain in the European Union in the referendum of 2016, while the other two (England and Wales) voted to leave.

Note that federalism can be distinguished from 'confederation'. A confederation exists where independent units agree to share some governmental institutions. Canada and the United States were once confederations. There are no modern instances, although the EU is sometimes regarded as a confederation. Thus, the two notions shade into each other, reinforcing the point that federalism is a loose notion.

*Rigid and flexible.* This concerns whether it is easy for those in power to change the constitution. In legal terms a rigid constitution is where a special process, such as a referendum of the people is required to change it. In a legal sense the UK Constitution is flexible since it can be changed in the same way as any other law. However, whether a constitution is easy to change depends more on politics than on law. In a political

sense the status quo is not easy to change in the UK since those in power are likely to benefit from it.

*Parliamentary and presidential.* The United Kingdom has a parliamentary system. In such a system, as applies to many western European countries, the people choose representatives who form the legislature, Parliament. The head of government is the prime minister (the chancellor in Austria and Germany), chosen by the Parliament. The prime minister chooses and removes ministers, who are the leaders of the executive government. Sometimes, as in the United Kingdom, these must also be members of the legislature. Parliament scrutinises government activities, consents to laws and provides the government with finance. It can ultimately dismiss the executive by withdrawing its support. Parliamentary government therefore looks strong and accountable. However, in practice the executive is likely to be dominant, if only because of the human tendency to defer to leaders.

In a parliamentary system there is usually a separate head of state who might be a hereditary monarch, as in the United Kingdom, or elected by the people, as in Ireland. The head of state formally represents the state and is the source of its authority but has little political power, except perhaps as a safety mechanism in the event of a serious political breakdown.

In a presidential system such as that of the United States, the leader of the executive, the president, is elected directly by the people independently of the legislature and holds office for a fixed period, subject (in some countries) to dismissal by the legislature. The president is usually also the head of state. Presidential government therefore gives the voter a greater choice. On the other hand, without a strong input from the legislature, accountability might be weak and when the legislature and president represent different political parties it might be difficult for the government to work effectively since its proposed laws may be blocked by the legislature. The device of a separate head of state in the parliamentary system has the advantages of separating the authority of the state from its political powers. In a parliamentary system the prime minister and other members of the executive are merely government employees who cannot (or, at least, should not) identify themselves with the state as such and so cannot claim reflected glory and immunity from criticism. The head of state has a symbolic role and also ensures continuity in the constitution. For example, if the government were to collapse it would be the responsibility of the head of state to ensure that government continued. Apart from this exceptional situation the Queen has little personal political power (Section 14.4), so that any respect due to her as representing the state does not carry the risk of tyranny.

*Unicameral or bicameral.* A unicameral constitution has a single lawmaking assembly. A bicameral constitution has two assemblies, each of which operates as a check on the other, the balance between them depending on the circumstances of the particular country. In the United States, for example, the Senate, the upper house, represents the states which comprise the federal system, with the legislature of each state, irrespective of its size, choosing two members, whereas Congress, the lower and larger house, is elected by the people generally, each state being represented according to the size of its population. Some European constitutions, such as those of Denmark, Sweden and Greece, are unicameral, and in most European constitutions the upper house cannot override the lower house. It is questionable whether an upper house serves a useful

purpose other than in a federal system in the US model, where each house can check the other from importantly different perspectives.

The UK Constitution is bicameral. The lower house, the House of Commons, with 650 members, is elected from the UK as a whole. The upper house, the House of Lords, with more than 800 members, is mainly appointed by the prime minister, which contrasts with other European countries where the upper houses are mainly elected. The House of Lords cannot override the Commons but serves as a revising chamber to scrutinise and amend legislation proposed by the lower house, thus providing an opportunity for second thoughts.

*Monarchical or republican: monarchy, aristocracy and democracy.* In a tradition dating back at least to Aristotle, there are three fundamental types of government: monarchy, or rule by one person; aristocracy, literally rule by a group of the 'best' people; and democracy, rule by the many or the people as a whole. According to Aristotle, each form of constitution has its virtues but also corresponding vices or deviations. The virtues exist when the ruler rules for the benefit of others; the vices when the ruler rules for the benefit of him or herself. According to Aristotle, the main merit of monarchy is its authority and independence since monarchs have a quasi-godlike status. The corresponding defect is despotism. The merit of aristocracy is wisdom; its defect is oligarchy, rule by a selfish group. The merit of democracy is consent of the community; its defect is instability leading to mob tyranny. Aristotle postulated a vicious cycle in which a monarch becomes a despot, is deposed by an aristocracy, which turns into an oligarchy and is overthrown by a popular rebellion. The ensuing democracy degenerates into chaos, resolved by the emergence of a dictator, who takes on the characteristics of a monarch, and so on. Aristotle therefore favoured what he called 'polity', a 'mixed government' combining all three (but loaded in favour of the middle classes) and with checks and balances between different branches of government.

In those European countries where monarchy remains, the powers of the monarch are invariably limited, in some cases being purely ceremonial. The monarchy in these countries is hereditary within a family and thus relatively independent of political pressures. The UK has a 'constitutional monarchy', meaning that the monarch cannot make law or exercise executive or judicial powers. In this way the risk of dictatorship is reduced and the monarchy serves as a harmless symbol representing the nation.

In 'republican' states the head of state is elected either by the Parliament or by the people. As we shall see (Section 2.5), the notion of republicanism amounts to rather more than this. It embraces democracy in a wide sense requiring equality in all aspects of government and, as such, has been of limited influence in the United Kingdom.

The United Kingdom retains an aristocratic element in the form of the House of Lords, one of the two parts of Parliament. The House of Commons, the members of which are elected as representatives of the people, is the more powerful part of Parliament.

*Monist and dualist.* This concerns how far the constitution is receptive to international law in the form, for example, of treaties between nations or resolutions of the United Nations (UN). In a monist state a treaty once ratified (confirmed) by the state is automatically part of that state's domestic law. For example, the Basic Law of the German Federal Republic, Article 25, states that the general principles of international law take precedence over domestic law and directly create rights and duties. The United Kingdom is a dualist state, in which international law is not binding in domestic law unless it has been adopted as part of our law usually by an Act of Parliament.

The UK Constitution could be summarised as:

- ▶ uncodified;
- ▶ with an incomplete separation of powers: the judiciary being independent but the executive and legislature partly combined;
- ▶ based on the rule of law and accountable government;
- ▶ unitary with federal aspects;
- ▶ legally flexible;
- ▶ a constitutional monarchy;
- ▶ parliamentary;
- ▶ a representative democracy with an aristocratic element;
- ▶ bicameral;
- ▶ dualist.

### 1.8 Public and private law

Constitutional law is the most basic aspect of 'public law'. Broadly, public law governs the relationship between the government and individuals and that between different governmental agencies. Private law concerns the relationship between individuals and also deals with private organisations such as companies. For reasons connected with a peculiarly English notion of the rule of law (Section 6.4) the distinction between public law and private law is less firmly embedded here than in the continental legal systems that inherited the distinction from Roman law. It was believed by the likes of Dicey that the liberties of the individual are best secured if the same law, broadly private law, governs officials and individuals alike so that officials have no special powers or status.

Attractive though this may be in certain respects, it is both unrealistic and arguably undesirable, given the huge powers that must be vested in the state to meet public demand for large-scale public services and government controls over daily life and the movement of the population.

Some writers have rejected the distinction between public and private law, at least on the level of fundamental principle, arguing that the same basic values and concepts pervade all law and that any given function could be carried out by the state or a private body (Section 19.5). It is difficult to deny that values such as fairness and openness are common to the private and public sectors, and that organisations such as charities that carry out functions for the benefit of the public on a non-profit basis have elements both of the public and of the private. This is particularly important today, when it is politically fashionable to entrust public services to profit-making private bodies. Moreover, there are numerous bodies not directly connected with the government that exercise vast powers over individuals, such as sporting and professional disciplinary bodies, trade unions and financial bodies. Beyond the core functions of keeping order and defence, there is no agreement in the United Kingdom as to what the proper sphere of the state is and which bodies are subject to public law.

Conversely, the Crown has the same legal powers as a private person, so government makes extensive use of private law in the contexts, for example, of contracts for the procurement of goods and equipment, employment and property. In this context

the government's economic power is so great (e.g. the purchase of NHS medicines) and its activities so wide-ranging that it might be argued that these 'soft' powers should be treated as having a distinctive public law character.

There are important distinctions between public law and private law. These include:

- ▶ The government represents the whole community, and its officials (at least in principle) have no self-interest of their own. By contrast, a private company and an individual both have a legitimate self-interest, including the profit motive. It follows that government should be accountable to the community as a whole for its actions. By contrast, in the case of a private body, accountability might be regarded as an unacceptable intrusion on its freedom.
- ▶ Arguably, private law is fundamentally different from public law in that it concerns the voluntary interaction of individuals, calling for compromises, recognition of agreed solutions and concessions to vulnerability, whereas public law calls predominantly for general principles designed to structure and contain power. For example, in private law a promise made is normally binding, whereas this is not usually the case in public law (Section 17.6.3).
- ▶ The government has the ultimate responsibility to protect the community against disruption and external threats. For this purpose it must be entrusted with special powers to use force. As we shall see in Chapter 25, concerning emergencies, it may be difficult or impossible to reconcile this with our belief that all power should be curbed by law.
- ▶ The distinction between public and private law has particular implications in two main contexts. Firstly, there is the question of the scope of judicial review of decisions made by powerful bodies. This is limited to 'functions of a public nature' (Section 19.5). Secondly, the protection of the HRA applies mainly against public bodies and against bodies certain of whose functions are public functions (Section 22.5). A similar approach is taken in both contexts, the matter depending upon the extent to which the body in question is linked to the central government, for example, whether the body in question has special powers, whether it is controlled or financed by the government and the public importance of its functions.

## 1.9 The direction of the constitution: reform

There is a widely shared belief that the constitution should not be subject to radical reforms but should evolve naturally, particular problems being dealt with as they arise. For example, there is strong resistance to altering the House of Lords on the basis that 'it works' (Section 12.3). This places constitutional reform at the mercy of the party politics of the day rather than subject to a special process designed to consider the long-term public interest. Ideally there should be a special independent process to consider the issues and validate the new constitution. The usual way of doing this is to hold a 'constitutional convention' composed of representatives of the main sectors of society. In a report issued in 2013 (HC 2012–13, 371), the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee of the House of Commons saw value in establishing such an institution to reflect upon the consequences of recent rapid constitutional changes, and the possible future of the United Kingdom. It is plausible that the continuing tensions between the parts of the UK which were exposed by the EU referendum in 2016 may strengthen

calls for the establishment of such a convention in the long run, but in the meantime most constitutional attention is likely to be exerted upon the process of withdrawal from the European Union.

Some commentators assert that there are general forces guiding the direction of the constitution. The 'Whig' view of history optimistically claims to find a progression from tyranny to democracy (Section 4.1). In this vein, Oliver (2009) suggests that four tendencies underlie constitutional reform. The first is towards 'principles'. These have been developed by the courts, for example, the 'legitimate expectation' (Section 18.3.1) and 'proportionality' (Section 18.1.1), and also from within government, for example, the 'Seven Principles of Public Life' (Section 5.9). The second tendency is towards 'governance', meaning reforming governmental processes. This would include, for example, the modernisation of parliamentary procedures. The third tendency, albeit perhaps hesitant and sporadic, is that of strengthening 'citizenship' in the sense of equality, for example the HRA. Oliver's fourth tendency is 'separation'. This would include devolution and the reforms to the court system made by the Constitutional Reform Act 2005, both of which enhance the separation of powers (Sections 7.5.3 and 7.6.2).

Bogdanor (2009) finds a tendency, albeit imperfect, towards dispersing power away from the centre and towards 'juridification' in the sense of using law rather than politics to make constitutional changes (see the discussion above on the 'political' and 'legal' constitution). There is also an increased reliance on written codes guiding the behaviour of politicians and officials. Some of these such as the *Ministerial Code* (Section 15.1) and the *Cabinet Manual* (Section 3.4.1) are not legally enforceable. Others, such as the provisions governing MPs' salaries and expenses (Section 11.7.2) are statutory. It may be that these practices reflect public distrust in the capacity of those in power to govern without external constraints (Section 5.9).

Contemporary issues have placed the traditional model of the constitution under strain. In particular, the authority of state constitutions is challenged by globalisation, which in this context includes:

- ▶ the commitment to free markets by the powerful countries who control the main international organisations (the UN, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank);
- ▶ a commitment, albeit less concrete, to international human rights and environmental standards, and the bringing to justice of political leaders who engage in international crimes such as genocide and torture;
- ▶ the ease with which money can be moved around the world;
- ▶ the international nature of problems such as terrorism, environmental protection and financial failure. State laws are sometimes ineffective, for example in dealing with terrorism, human trafficking and financial corruption;
- ▶ the fact that individual countries are increasingly dependent on others for resources and security.

The constitution provides filter mechanisms which to a certain extent recognise and control the influences of international actions and relationships on our own law and vice versa (Section 9.5), but otherwise the law has not adapted to globalisation. International affairs are still based on seventeenth-century ideas of self-contained sovereign states.



## Summary

- ▶ Having read this chapter, you should have a general idea of some basic constitutional concepts and how they relate to the UK. Constitutions deal with the fundamental framework of government and its powers, reflecting the political interests of those who design and operate them and providing mechanisms for the control of government. The UK Constitution does not adequately address the international dimension of modern government.
- ▶ The UK Constitution is unwritten in the sense that there is no special constitutional document giving it a status superior to the ordinary law. The UK Constitution is made up of many ordinary laws and political conventions. Any special status depends on courts and officials giving it special weight when making decisions.
- ▶ The aim of a constitution is to manage disagreement in circumstances where collective action on behalf of the whole community is required. The UK Constitution provides a framework for this purpose. In particular, the courts protect basic individual rights.
- ▶ There is an underlying dispute as to how far constitutional disputes should be settled by courts or by elected bodies.
- ▶ There is a tendency in any form of government for powers to gravitate towards a single group so that a primary concern of constitutional law is to provide checks and balances between different branches of government. We introduced the basic concepts of sovereignty, the rule of law, separation of powers and fundamental rights. However, the unwritten UK Constitution does not prevent power being concentrated in the hands of a wealthy minority.
- ▶ Political and legal aspects of a constitution should be distinguished, although the boundary between them is leaky and they have different perspectives. The legal aspects of the constitution are a distinctive part of the wider political context, each influencing the other. There are also important constitutional principles in the form of conventions and practices operating without a formal legal basis.
- ▶ The distinction between written and unwritten constitutions is of some but not fundamental importance. We compared the main advantages and disadvantages of written and unwritten constitutions without committing ourselves to one or the other since the matter is one for political choice. The UK Constitution is an untidy mixture of different kinds of law practices and customs and has a substantial informal element, which might lend itself to domination by certain networks or elites.
- ▶ We outlined the main categories of constitutions, emphasising that these are models and that actual constitutions need not closely correspond to any pure model. In particular we discussed 'parliamentary' and 'presidential' models, the former concentrating power, the latter splitting it up. The UK Constitution is strongly parliamentary with perhaps a tendency towards federalism.
- ▶ The distinction between public law and private law is important, particularly in the context of the HRA and of judicial review of powerful bodies. The courts have adopted a pragmatic approach to this question of classification.

## Exercises

- 1.1 You are discussing constitutional law with an American legal expert who claims that the United Kingdom has no constitution. What does she mean and how would you respond?
- 1.2 Sir John Laws ('The Constitution, Morals and Rights' [1996] PL 622) described a constitution as 'that set of legal rules which govern the relationship in a state between the ruler and the ruled'. To what extent is this an adequate description of the UK Constitution?

- 1.3** How well does the UK Constitution fit the various methods of classifying constitutions mentioned in this chapter?
- 1.4** It is both a strength and a potential weakness of the British Constitution that, almost uniquely for an advanced democracy, it is not all set down in writing (Royal Commission on the Reform of the House of Lords, Cm 4534, 2000) (the Wakeham Report).  
Discuss.
- 1.5** Should the courts have the power to overturn legislation?
- 1.6** Compare the merits of the parliamentary and presidential systems of government.
- 1.7** The government announces that in future all proposals for new laws will be scrutinised in private by a 'forum' comprising the chief executives of the main banks and representatives of companies who contribute to the governing party. Are there any constitutional objections to this? Is further information needed to enable you to decide?

## Further reading

- Barber, *The Constitutional State* (Oxford University Press 2010)
- \*Barker, 'Against a Written Constitution' [2008] PL 11
- Blick, *Beyond Magna Carta: A Constitution for the United Kingdom* (Hart Publishing 2015)
- Bellamy, *Political Constitutionalism* (Cambridge University Press 2007) ch 1
- Bogdanor, *The New British Constitution* (Hart Publishing 2009)
- \*Bogdanor and Vogenauer, 'Enacting a British Constitution: Some Problems' [2008] PL 38
- Ewing, 'The Politics of the British Constitution' [2000] PL 405
- Feldman, "'Which in Your Case You Have Not Got": Constitutionalism at Home and Abroad' (2011) 64 CLP 117
- \*Feldman, 'None, One or Several? Perspectives on the UK's Constitution(s)' (2005) 64 CLJ 329
- Feldman (ed), *Law in Politics, Politics in Law* (Hart Publishing 2013)
- \*Finer, Bogdanor and Rudden, *Comparing Constitutions* (Oxford University Press 1995) ch 1
- Gee, 'The Political Constitutionalism of JAG Griffith' (2008) 28 LS 20
- Gee and Webber, 'What Is a Political Constitution?' (2010) 30 OJLS 273
- Griffith, 'The Common Law and the Political Constitution' (2001) 117 LQR 42
- \*Griffith, 'The Political Constitution' (1979) 42 MLR 1
- \*Harlow and Rawlings, *Law and Administration* (3rd edn, Cambridge University Press 2009) ch 1
- \*Hennessy, *The Hidden Wiring: Unearthing the British Constitution* (Gollancz 1995) Prologue, ch 1
- Hickman, 'In Defence of the Legal Constitution' (2005) 55 U Toronto LJ 981
- \*Leyland, *The Constitution of the United Kingdom: A Contextual Analysis* (Bloomsbury 2016)
- \*Loughlin, *The British Constitution: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford University Press 2013)
- Loughlin, *Foundations of Public Law* (Oxford University Press 2010) ch 10
- Loughlin, *Sword and Scales* (Hart Publishing 2005)
- MacCormick, *Institutions of Law* (Oxford University Press 2007) chs 1–4, 10
- \*Munro, *Studies in Constitutional Law* (2nd edn, Butterworths 1999) ch 1
- Oliver, *Constitutional Reform in the United Kingdom* (Oxford University Press 2003)
- Oliver, 'The United Kingdom Constitution in Transition: From Where to Where?' in Andenas and Fairgrieve (eds), *Tom Bingham and the Transformation of the Law* (Oxford University Press 2009)

**Further reading cont'd**

- Poole, 'Tilting at Windmills? Truth and Illusion in the Political Constitution' (2007) 70 MLR 250
- \*Qvortrup, 'Let Me Take You to a Foreign Land: The Political and the Legal Constitution' in Qvortrup (ed), *The British Constitution: Continuity and Change* (Hart Publishing 2013)
- \*Ridley, 'There Is No British Constitution: A Dangerous Case of the Emperor's Clothes' (1988) 41 Parl Aff 340
- Tomkins, 'In Defence of the Political Constitution' (2002) 22 OJLS 157
- \*Ward, *The English Constitution: Myths and Realities* (Hart Publishing 2004)