

LL1001: Public Law

View Online



[1]

Ahmed, F. and Perry, A. 2016. Constitutional Statutes. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. (2016). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqw030>.

[2]

Ahmed, F. and Perry, A. 2014. The Coherence of the Doctrine of Legitimate Expectations. The Cambridge Law Journal. 73, 1 (2014), 61–85.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197314000026>.

[3]

Alder, J. and Syrett, K. 2017. Constitutional and Administrative Law. Palgrave Macmillan.

[4]

Alder, J. and Syrett, K. 2017. The Rule of Law. Constitutional and Administrative Law. Palgrave Macmillan. 121–137.

[5]

Alder, J. and Syrett, K. 2017. Underlying Political Traditions. Constitutional and Administrative Law. Palgrave Macmillan. 26–54.

[6]

Ali v United Kingdom: Article 6(1) ECHR and Administrative Decision-Making | Public Law

for Everyone:

<https://publiclawforeveryone.com/2016/03/13/ali-v-united-kingdom-article-61-echr-and-administrative-decision-making/>.

[7]

Allan, T.R.S. 2003. Constitutional Dialogue and the Justification of Judicial Review. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 23, 4 (2003).

[8]

Allan, T.R.S. 2005. *Constitutional Justice: A Liberal Theory of the Rule of Law*. Oxford University Press.

[9]

Allan, T.R.S. 2005. *Constitutional Justice: A Liberal Theory of the Rule of Law*. Oxford University Press.

[10]

Allan, T.R.S. 2006. Human Rights and Judicial Review: A Critique of "Due Deference". *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 65, 3 (2006), 671–695.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197306007264>.

[11]

Allan, T.R.S. 2011. Judicial Deference and Judicial Review: Legal Doctrine and Legal Theory. *Law Quarterly Review*. 127, 1 (2011).

[12]

Allan, T.R.S. 2002. The Constitutional Foundations of Judicial Review: Conceptual Conundrum or Interpretative Inquiry? *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 61, 1 (2002), 87–125.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S000819730200154X>.

[13]

Arvind, T.T. 2017. The Curious Origins of Judicial Review. *Law Quarterly Review*. (2017), 91-117.

[14]

Atrill, S. 2003. WHO IS THE "FAIR-MINDED AND INFORMED OBSERVER"? BIAS AFTER. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 62, 2 (2003), 279-289.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197303006317>.

[15]

Bamforth, N. 1997. Fairness and Legitimate Expectation in Judicial Review. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 56, 1 (1997), 1-4. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197300017530>.

[16]

Barber, N.W. 2009. Laws and Constitutional Conventions. *Law Quarterly Review*. 125, (2009), 294-309.

[17]

Barber, N.W. 2009. Laws and Constitutional Conventions. *Law Quarterly Review*. (2009), 294-309.

[18]

Barber, N.W. 2001. Prelude to the Separation of Powers. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 60, 1 (2001), 59-88. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197301000629>.

[19]

Barber, N.W. 2001. Review: The Academic Mythologists. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 21, 2 (2001).

[20]

Bingham, T.H. 2011. *The Rule of Law*. Penguin.

[21]

Blake, N. 2002. Importing Proportionality: Clarification or Confusion. *European Human Rights Law Review*. (2002), 19–27.

[22]

Blog | UK Constitutional Law Association | affiliated to the International Association of Constitutional Law: <https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/blog/>.

[23]

British and Irish Legal Information Institute: <http://www.bailii.org/>.

[24]

Campbell, N.R. 1994. The Duty to Give Reasons in Administrative Law. *Public Law*. (1994), 184–191.

[25]

Chan, C. 2016. A Preliminary Framework for Measuring Deference in Rights Reasoning. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*. 14, 4 (2016), 851–882.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mow058>.

[26]

Clayton, R. 2015. The Empire Strikes Back: Common Law Rights and the Human Rights Act. *Public Law*. (2015), 3–12.

[27]

Constitution Committee | UK Parliament:
<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/lords-select/constitution-committee/>.

[28]

Craig, P. 1999. Competing Models of Judicial Review. *Public Law*. (1999), 428–447.

[29]

Craig, P. 1997. Formal and Substantive Conceptions of the Rule of Law: An Analytical Framework. *Public Law*. (1997), 467–487.

[30]

Craig, P. 2011. Political Constitutionalism and the Judicial Role: A Response. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*. 9, 1 (2011), 112–131.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mor025>.

[31]

Craig, P. 2001. The Courts, the Human Rights Act and Judicial Review. *Law Quarterly Review*. (2001), 589–603.

[32]

Craig, P. 2003. The Human Rights Act, Article 6 and Procedural Rights. *Public Law*. (2003), 753–773.

[33]

Craig, P. 2013. The Nature of Reasonableness Review. *Current Legal Problems*. 66, 1 (2013), 131–167. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/cut010>.

[34]

Craig, P. 1998. Ultra Vires and the Foundations of Judicial Review. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 57, 1 (1998), 63–90. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197300134397>.

[35]

Craig, P. and Schonberg, S. 2000. Substantive Legitimate Expectations After Coughlan.

Public Law. (2000), 684–701.

[36]

Craig, R. 2017. A Simple Application of the Frustration Principle: Prerogative, Statute and Miller. Public Law. (2017).

[37]

Daly, P. 2010. Justiciability and the 'Political Question' Doctrine. Public Law. (2010), 160–178.

[38]

Delegated Legislation | UK Parliament:
<https://www.parliament.uk/about/how/laws/delegated/>.

[39]

Elliott, M. and Thomas, R. 2017. Themes, Sources, and Principles. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[40]

Elliott, M. 2015. A Tangled Constitutional Web: The Black-Spider Memos and the British Constitution's Relational Architecture. Public Law. (2015), 539–550.

[41]

Elliott, M. 2006. Legitimate Expectations: Procedure, Substance, Policy and Proportionality. The Cambridge Law Journal. 65, 2 (2006), 254–256.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197306227119>.

[42]

Elliott, M. 2012. The Appearance of Bias, the Fair-Minded and Informed Observer, and the "Ordinary Person in Queen Square Market". The Cambridge Law Journal. 71, 2 (2012), 247–250. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197312000372>.

[43]

Elliott, M. 1999. The Demise of Parliamentary Sovereignty? the Implications for Justifying Judicial Review. *Law Quarterly Review*. (1999), 119–137.

[44]

Elliott, M. 2015. The Principle of Parliamentary Sovereignty in Legal, Constitutional, and Political Perspective. *The Changing Constitution*. J.L. Jowell et al., eds. Oxford University Press. 38–66.

[45]

Elliott, M. and Thomas, R. 2017. *Public Law*. Oxford University Press.

[46]

Elliott, M. and Thomas, R. 2017. *Public Law*. Oxford University Press.

[47]

Elliott, M. and Thomas, R. 2017. Themes, Sources, and Principles. *Public Law*. Oxford University Press. 36–86.

[48]

European Court of Human Rights: <http://www.echr.coe.int/Pages/home.aspx?p=home>.

[49]

Feldman, D. 2005. None, One or Several? Perspectives on the UK's Constitution(s). *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 64, 2 (2005), 329–351.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197305006884>.

[50]

Fenwick, H. 2002. The Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001: A Proportionate Response to 11 September? *The Modern Law Review*. 65, 5 (2002), 724–762. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.00405>.

[51]

Ferreira, N. 2015. The Supreme Court in a Final Push to Go Beyond Strasbourg. *Public Law*. (2015).

[52]

Forsyth, C. 1996. Of Fig Leaves and Fairy Tales: The Ultra Vires Doctrine, the Sovereignty of Parliament and Judicial Review. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 55, 1 (1996), 122–140. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197300097762>.

[53]

Forsyth, C. and Elliott, M. 2003. The Legitimacy of Judicial Review. *Public Law*. (2003), 286–307.

[54]

Gavin Phillipson: Historic Commons Syria Vote: The Constitutional Significance (Part I) | UK Constitutional Law Association:
<https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/2013/09/19/gavin-phillipson-historic-commons-syria-vote-the-constitutional-significance-part-i/>.

[55]

Gavin Phillipson: Historic Commons Syria Vote: The Constitutional Significance. Part II the Way Forward | UK Constitutional Law Association:
<https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/2013/11/29/gavin-phillipson-historic-commons-syria-vote-the-constitutional-significance-part-ii-the-way-forward/>.

[56]

Gee, G. and Webber, G.C.N. 2010. What Is a Political Constitution? *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 30, 2 (2010), 273–299. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqq013>.

[57]

Goldsworthy, J. 2003. Homogenizing Constitutions. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 23, 3 (2003), 483–505. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/23.3.483>.

[58]

Gordon, M. 2015. *Parliamentary Sovereignty in the UK Constitution: Process, Politics and Democracy*. Hart Publishing.

[59]

Gregson, R. 2017. When Should There Be an Implied Power to Delegate? *Public Law*. (2017), 408–425.

[60]

Hale, B. 2012. Argentoratum Locutum: Is Strasbourg or the Supreme Court Supreme? *Human Rights Law Review*. 12, 1 (2012), 65–78. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngs001>.

[61]

Hale, Lady 2015. 'The UK Supreme Court in the UK Constitution' (Inaugural Lecture at the Institute for Legal and Constitutional Research, University of St Andrews, 8th of October 2015).

[62]

Hickman, T. 2008. The Substance and Structure of Proportionality. *Public Law*. (2008), 694–716.

[63]

Hilson, C. 2002. Judicial Review, Policies and the Fettering of Discretion. *Public Law*. (2002), 111–129.

[64]

'Historic' Commons' Syria Vote: The Constitutional Significance. Part I | UK Constitutional Law Association:
<https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/2013/09/19/gavin-phillipson-historic-commons-syria-vote-the-constitutional-significance-part-i/>.

[65]

"Historic" Commons' Syria Vote: The Constitutional Significance. Part II | the Way Forward – UK Constitutional Law Association:
<https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/2013/11/29/gavin-phillipson-historic-commons-syria-vote-the-constitutional-significance-part-ii-the-way-forward/>.

[66]

Jaconelli, J. 2005. Do Constitutional Conventions Bind? The Cambridge Law Journal. 64, 1 (2005), 149–176. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197305006823>.

[67]

Jaconelli, J. 2005. Do Constitutional Conventions Bind? The Cambridge Law Journal. 64, 1 (2005), 149–176. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197305006823>.

[68]

Jones, B.C. 2016. Preliminary Warnings on 'Constitutional' Idolatry. Public Law. (2016), 74–92.

[69]

Jowell, J. 1999. Of Vires and Vacuums: The Constitutional Context of Judicial Review. Public Law. (1999), 448–460.

[70]

Jowell, J. 2006. Parliamentary Sovereignty Under the New Constitutional Hypothesis. Public Law. (2006), 562–579.

[71]

Jowell, J. and Lester, A. 1988. Beyond Wednesbury: Substantive Principles of Administrative Law. *Commonwealth Law Bulletin*. 14, 2 (1988), 858–870.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/03050718.1988.9985971>.

[72]

Judicial Power and the United Kingdom's Changing Constitution | Public Law for Everyone: 2018.
<https://publiclawforeveryone.com/2017/10/31/judicial-power-and-the-united-kingdoms-changing-constitution/>.

[73]

Kavanaugh, A. 2010. Defending Deference in Public Law and Constitutional Theory. *Law Quarterly Review*. 222, (2010).

[74]

Knight, C.J.S. 2009. A Framework for Fettering. *Judicial Review*. 14, 1 (2009), 73–80.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/10854681.2009.11426590>.

[75]

Le Sueur, A.P. 1999. Legal Duties to Give Reasons. *Current Legal Problems*. 52, 1 (1999), 150–172. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/52.1.150>.

[76]

Le Sueur, A.P. et al. 2016. *Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials*. Oxford University Press.

[77]

Le Sueur, A.P. et al. 2019. *Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials*. Oxford University Press.

[78]

Lever, A. 2007. Is Judicial Review Undemocratic? Public Law. (2007), 280–298.

[79]

Lord Lester of Herne Hill 2001. Developing Constitutional Principles of Public Law. Public Law. (2001), 684–694.

[80]

Loveland, I. 2021. Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction. Oxford University Press.

[81]

Loveland, I. 2021. Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction. Oxford University Press.

[82]

Loveland, I. 2003. Does Homelessness Decision Making Engage Article 6(1) of the European Convention on Human Rights? European Human Rights Law Review. (2003), 176–204.

[83]

Loveland, I. 2015. Human Rights II: Emergent Principles. Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction. Oxford University Press. 588–615.

[84]

Loveland, I. 2018. Human Rights II: Emergent Principles. Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction. Oxford University Press.

[85]

Malleson, K. 2000. Judicial Bias and Disqualification After Pinochet (No. 2). Modern Law Review. 63, 1 (2000), 119–127. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.00254>.

[86]

Mark Elliot: Reflections on the HS2 Case: A Hierarchy of Domestic Constitutional Norms and the Qualified Primacy of EU Law | UK Constitutional Law Association:
<https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/2014/01/23/mark-elliott-reflections-on-the-hs2-case-a-hierarchy-of-domestic-constitutional-norms-and-the-qualified-primacy-of-eu-law/>.

[87]

Mark Elliott: Justification, Calibration and Substantive Judicial Review: Putting Doctrine in its Place | UK Constitutional Law Association:
<https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/2013/09/17/mark-elliott-justification-calibration-and-substantive-judicial-review-putting-doctrine-in-its-place/>.

[88]

Masterman, R. and Murray, C. 2013. Law, Politics, and the United Kingdom Constitution. Exploring Constitutional and Administrative Law. Pearson. 88–108.

[89]

Masterman, R. and Murray, C. 2003. Law, Politics, and the United Kingdom Constitution. Exploring Constitutional and Administrative Law. 88–108.

[90]

Murkens, J.E.K. 2018. Democracy as the Legitimizing Condition in the UK Constitution. Legal Studies. 38, 01 (2018), 42–58. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2017.10>.

[91]

Nicol, D. 2006. Law and Politics After the Human Rights Act. Public Law. (2006), 722–751.

[92]

Norris, M. 1996. Ex Parte Smith: Irrationality and Human Rights. Public Law. (1996), 590–600.

[93]

Oliver, D. 1987. Is the Ultra Vires Rule the Basis of Judicial Review? *Public Law*. (1987), 543–569.

[94]

Olowofoyeku, A.A. 2009. Bias and the Informed Observer: A Call for a Return to Gough. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 68, 2 (2009), 388–409.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197309000373>.

[95]

Olowofoyeku, A.A. 2000. The Nemo Judex Rule: The Case Against Automatic Disqualification. *Public Law*. (2000), 456–475.

[96]

Perry, A. and Tucker, A. 2018. Top-Down Constitutional Conventions. *The Modern Law Review*. 81, 5 (2018), 765–789. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12364>.

[97]

Political and Constitutional Reform Committee | UK Parliament:
<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/political-and-constitutional-reform-committee/>.

[98]

Poole, T. 2005. Of Headscarves and Heresies: The Denbigh High School Case and Public Authority Decision-Making Under the Human Rights Act. *Public Law*. (2005), 685–695.

[99]

Poole, T. 2009. The Reformation of English Administrative Law. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 68, 1 (2009), 142–168. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197309000063>.

[100]

Principles of Good Administration | Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO):
<https://www.ombudsman.org.uk/about-us/our-principles/principles-good-administration>.

[101]

Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee | UK Parliament:
<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/public-administration-and-constitutional-affairs-committee/>.

[102]

Rainey, B. et al. 2014. Context, Background, and Institutions. Jacobs, White and Ovey: The European Convention on Human Rights. Oxford University Press. 3-20.

[103]

Ringhand, L. 2005. Fig Leaves, Fairy Tales, and Constitutional Foundations: Debating Judicial Review in Britain. Columbia Journal of Transnational Law. 43, 3 (2005).

[104]

Rivers, J. 2006. Proportionality and Variable Intensity of Review. Cambridge Law Journal. 65, (2006), 174-207.

[105]

Sales, P. 2013. Rationality, Proportionality and the Development of the Law. Law Quarterly Review. (2013), 223-241.

[106]

Stanton, J. et al. 2018. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[107]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Access to Review and Remedies. Public

Law. Oxford University Press.

[108]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Access to Review and Remedies. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[109]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Illegality. Public law. Oxford University Press.

[110]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Illegality. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[111]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Irrationality and Proportionality. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[112]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Irrationality and Proportionality. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[113]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[114]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[115]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[116]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[117]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[118]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. The Royal Prerogative and Constitutional Conventions. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[119]

Stanton, J. and Prescott, C. 2018. The Royal Prerogative and Constitutional Conventions. Public Law. Oxford University Press.

[120]

Stark, S.W. 2017. Facing Facts: Judicial Approaches to Section 4 of the Human Rights Act 1998. Law Quarterly Review. (2017).

[121]

Supperstone, M. and Coppel, J. 1999. Judicial Review After the Human Rights Act. European Human Rights Law Review. (1999), 301–329.

[122]

Taming the Prerogative: Strengthening Ministerial Accountability to Parliament: 2003.
<https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpdocumentview?accountid=11455&>

amp;groupid=103502&pgId=c5aea05f-b8ed-42b0-b2e6-8c68938d85ec.

[123]

Taylor, R.B. 2015. Foundational and Regulatory Conventions: Exploring the Constitutional Significance of Britain's Dependency Upon Conventions. *Public Law*. (2015), 614–632.

[124]

Taylor, R.B. 2015. Foundational and Regulatory Conventions: Exploring the Constitutional Significance of Britain's Dependency Upon Conventions. *Public Law*. (2015), 614–632.

[125]

The Constitution Unit Blog: <https://constitution-unit.com/>.

[126]

Tomkins, A. 2002. In Defence of the Political Constitution. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 22, 1 (2002), 157–175. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/22.1.157>.

[127]

Tomlinson, J. 2017. The Narrow Approach to Substantive Legitimate Expectations and the Trend of Modern Authority. *Oxford University Commonwealth Law Journal*. 17, 1 (2017), 75–84. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/14729342.2017.1311514>.

[128]

Turner, I. 2009. Irrationality, the Human Rights Act and the Limits of Merits-Review. *Nottingham Law Journal*. 18, (2009), 18–36.

[129]

UK Constitutional Law Association Blog | International Association of Constitutional Law: <https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/blog/>.

[130]

UK Human Rights Blog: <https://ukhumanrightsblog.com/>.

[131]

UK Parliament: <http://www.parliament.uk/>.

[132]

Unmarried Mother Siobhan McLaughlin Wins Supreme Court Benefit Case | BBC: 2018.
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-45355028>.

[133]

Varuhas, J.N.E. 2013. The Reformation of English Administrative Law? "Rights", Rhetoric and Reality. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 72, 2 (2013), 369–413.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197313000500>.

[134]

Varuhas, J.N.E. 2013. The Reformation of English Administrative Law? "Rights", Rhetoric and Reality. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 72, 2 (2013), 369–413.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197313000500>.

[135]

Waldron, J. 2006. The Core of the Case Against Judicial Review. *The Yale Law Journal*. 115, 6 (2006). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/20455656>.

[136]

Walker, P. 1995. What's Wrong With Irrationality? *Public Law*. (1995), 556–576.

[137]

Watson, J. 2010. Clarity and Ambiguity: A New Approach to the Test of Legitimacy in the Law of Legitimate Expectations. *Legal Studies*. 30, 4 (2010), 633–652.

DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-121X.2010.00177.x>.

[138]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2021. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[139]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2021. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[140]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions and Roles' and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press. 13–15.

[141]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions and Roles' and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[142]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2015. Human Rights. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press. 255–290.

[143]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Human Rights. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[144]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2015. Human Rights. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press. 255–290.

[145]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Human Rights. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[146]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Illegality. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[147]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Illegality. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[148]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Irrationality and Proportionality. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[149]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Irrationality and Proportionality. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[150]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2015. Parliamentary Supremacy: The Theory. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press. 185–226.

[151]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Parliamentary Supremacy: The Theory. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[152]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Procedural Impropriety. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[153]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Procedural Impropriety. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[154]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Procedural Impropriety. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[155]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. Procedural Impropriety. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[156]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2015. The Crown Royal Perogative. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press. 145–182.

[157]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. The Crown Royal Perogative. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[158]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2015. The Role of Constitutional Conventions. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press. 365–393.

[159]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. The Role of Constitutional Conventions. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[160]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. The Role of Constitutional Conventions. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[161]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. The Role of Constitutional Conventions. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[162]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. The Role of the Courts, Judicial Review, and Human Rights. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[163]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. The Role of the Courts, Judicial Review, and Human Rights. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[164]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2015. The Rule of Law. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press. 77–113.

[165]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. The Rule of Law. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[166]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. 'What is Public Law' and 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions, and Roles', and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press. 3–76.

[167]

Webley, L. and Samuels, H. 2018. What is Public Law' and 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions, and Roles', and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press.

[168]

Where Next for the Wednesbury Principle? a Brief Response to Lord Carnwath | Public Law for Everyone:
<https://publiclawforeveryone.com/2013/11/19/where-next-for-the-wednesbury-principle-a-brief-response-to-lord-carnwath/>.

[169]

Williams, D. 2000. Bias; the Judges and the Separation of Powers. Public Law. (2000), 45–60.

[170]

Williams, R. 2017. Structuring Substantive Review. Public Law. (2017), 99–123.

[171]

Wong, G. 2000. Towards the Nutcracker Principle: Reconsidering the Objections to Proportionality. Public Law. (2000), 92–109.

[172]

Young, A.L. 2011. Is Dialogue Working Under the Human Rights Act 1998? Public Law. (2011), 773–800.

[173]

Young, A.L. 2014. Will You, Won't You, Will You Join the Deference Dance? Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 34, 2 (2014), 375–394. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqu004>.

[174]

An Application by Siobhan McLaughlin for Judicial Review [2016] NICA 53.

[175]

Attorney General v Jonathan Cape Ltd [1976] QB 752.

[176]

British Railways Board v Pickin [1974] AC 765.

[177]

Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service [1985] AC 374.

[178]

Exercise of Discretion in Administrative Decision-Making.

[179]

Ghaidan v. Godin-Mendoza [2004] UKHL 30.

[180]

Human Rights Act 1998.

[181]

In the Matter of an Application by Siobhan McLaughlin for Judicial Review (Northern Ireland) [2018] UKSC 48.

[182]

International Journal of Constitutional Law.

[183]

Jackson & Ors v. Her Majesty's Attorney General [2005] UKHL 56.

[184]

Jackson & Ors v. Her Majesty's Attorney General [2005] UKHL 56.

[185]

Legal Studies: The Journal of the Society of Legal Scholars.

[186]

Liversidge v Anderson [1941] UKHL 1.

[187]

McLoughlin Supreme Court Press Summary.

[188]

Miller & Anor, R (on the application of) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union (Rev 3) [2017] UKSC 5.

[189]

Oxford Journal of Legal Studies.

[190]

Public Law.

[191]

R (Chester) v Secretary of State for Justice [2013] UKSC 63.

[192]

R (Evans) v Attorney General [2015] UKSC 21.

[193]

R (Miller) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union [2017] UKSC 5, [40]-[49].

[194]

R (on the application of Nicklinson and another) (Appellants) v Ministry of Justice (Respondent) [2014] UKSC 38.

[195]

The Cambridge Law Journal.

[196]

The Law Quarterly Review.

[197]

The Modern Law Review.

[198]

Tomlinson and Others v Birmingham City Council [2010] UKSC 8.

[199]

Tomlinson and Others v Birmingham City Council [2010] UKSC 8.

[200]

Unmarried Mother Wins Supreme Court Fight for Widowed Parents' Allowance | Good Morning Britain | YouTube.