

LL1001: Public Law

[View Online](#)

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

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

Alder, J., & Syrett, K. (2017a). *Constitutional and Administrative Law: Vol. Palgrave Law Masters* (11th Edition). Palgrave Macmillan.

Alder, J., & Syrett, K. (2017b). The Rule of Law. In *Constitutional and Administrative Law: Vol. Palgrave Law Masters* (11th Edition, pp. 121–137). Palgrave Macmillan.

Alder, J., & Syrett, K. (2017c). Underlying Political Traditions. In *Constitutional and Administrative Law: Vol. Palgrave Law Masters* (11th Edition, pp. 26–54). Palgrave Macmillan.

Ali v United Kingdom: Article 6(1) ECHR and Administrative Decision-Making | Public Law for Everyone. (n.d.). <https://publiclawforeveryone.com/2016/03/13/ali-v-united-kingdom-article-61-echr-and-administrative-decision-making/>

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

Allan, T. R. S. (2003). Constitutional Dialogue and the Justification of Judicial Review. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 23(4). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3600687>

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

Allan, T. R. S. (2005b). *Constitutional Justice: A Liberal Theory of the Rule of Law*. Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199267880.001.0001>

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

Allan, T. R. S. (2011). Judicial Deference and Judicial Review: Legal Doctrine and Legal Theory. *Law Quarterly Review*, 127(1). <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I38697650034411E088BDC597D432CBAC/View/FullText>

.html?skipAnonymous=true

An Application by Siobhan McLaughlin for Judicial Review [2016] NICA 53. (n.d.).
<https://judiciaryni.uk/sites/judiciary/files/decisions/McLaughlin%27s%20%28Siobhan%29%20Application.pdf>

Arvind, T. T. (2017). The Curious Origins of Judicial Review. *Law Quarterly Review*, 91–117.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I17F84060BE0811E689319702776550D2/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

Attorney General v Jonathan Cape Ltd [1976] QB 752.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI694B9730E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

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

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

Barber, N. W. (2001b). Review: The Academic Mythologists. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 21(2). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20468373>

Barber, N. W. (2009a). Laws and Constitutional Conventions. *Law Quarterly Review*, 125, 294–309.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI69EDD0210ACD11DE953BC0C525628E94%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

Barber, N. W. (2009b). Laws and Constitutional Conventions. *Law Quarterly Review*, 294–309.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I69EDD0210ACD11DE953BC0C525628E94/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

Blake, N. (2002). Importing Proportionality: Clarification or Confusion. *European Human Rights Law Review*, 19–27.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I84B178A0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

British and Irish Legal Information Institute. (n.d.). <http://www.bailii.org/>

British Railways Board v Pickin [1974] AC 765.
<http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/1974/1.html>

Campbell, N. R. (1994). The Duty to Give Reasons in Administrative Law. Public Law, 184–191.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID39F4B20E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

Clayton, R. (2015). The Empire Strikes Back: Common Law Rights and the Human Rights Act. Public Law, 3–12.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FIAD111C107B4F11E499B9D6E1F6E110C8%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

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

Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service [1985] AC 374.
<http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/1984/9.html>

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

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

Craig, P. (1999). Competing Models of Judicial Review. Public Law, 428–447.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID132DF00E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Craig, P. (2001). The Courts, the Human Rights Act and Judicial Review. Law Quarterly Review, 589–603.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I848E3930E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Craig, P. (2003). The Human Rights Act, Article 6 and Procedural Rights. Public Law, 753–773.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I84890911E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

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

Craig, P., & Schonberg, S. (2000). Substantive Legitimate Expectations After Coughlan. *Public Law*, 684–701.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I84A4F580E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Craig, R. (2017). A Simple Application of the Frustration Principle: Prerogative, Statute and Miller. *Public Law*.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Ffoala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI8106D680C87411E79CFE663275FD29%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

Daly, P. (2010). Justiciability and the 'Political Question' Doctrine. *Public Law*, 160–178.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Ffoala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI14A4A19044F511E88D34E20E69C76312%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

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

Elliott, M., & Thomas, R. (2017). Themes, Sources, and Principles. In *Public Law* (3rd edn). Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198765899.001.0001>

Elliott, M. (n.d.). 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/>

Elliott, M. (1999). The Demise of Parliamentary Sovereignty? the Implications for Justifying Judicial Review. *Law Quarterly Review*, 119–137.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ICCCA7BD0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

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), 247–250.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197312000372>

Elliott, M. (2015a). A Tangled Constitutional Web: The Black-Spider Memos and the British Constitution's Relational Architecture. *Public Law*, 539–550.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Ffoala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI3A34F4805C5611E58916B963212E7CCD%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

Elliott, M. (2015b). The Principle of Parliamentary Sovereignty in Legal, Constitutional, and Political Perspective. In J. L. Jowell, D. Oliver, & C. O'Cinneide (Eds.), *The Changing Constitution* (8th Edition, pp. 38–66). Oxford University Press.

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

Elliott, M., & Thomas, R. (2017a). Public Law (3rd Edition). Oxford University Press.

Elliott, M., & Thomas, R. (2017b). Public Law (3rd edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198765899.001.0001>

Elliott, M., & Thomas, R. (2017c). Themes, Sources, and Principles. In Public Law (3rd Edition, pp. 36–86). Oxford University Press.

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

Exercise of Discretion in Administrative Decision-Making. (n.d.).
<http://www.ombudsman.wa.gov.au/Publications/Documents/guidelines/Exercise-of-discretion-in-admin-decision-making.pdf>

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

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

Ferreira, N. (2015). The Supreme Court in a Final Push to Go Beyond Strasbourg. Public Law.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI5409B340105311E5995D9B4942D36284%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

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), 122–140.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197300097762>

Forsyth, C., & Elliott, M. (2003). The Legitimacy of Judicial Review. Public Law, 286–307.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I795AA3A0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

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

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

Ghaidan v. Godin-Mendoza [2004] UKHL 30.
<http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/2004/30.html>

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

Gordon, M. (2015). *Parliamentary Sovereignty in the UK Constitution: Process, Politics and Democracy*: Vol. v. 4. Hart Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781474201667>

Gregson, R. (2017). When Should There Be an Implied Power to Delegate? *Public Law*, 408–425.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IB5E035E04C6411E79A6EF925F51871C7/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

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 (pp. 1–17). <https://www.supremecourt.uk/docs/speech-151008.pdf>

Hickman, T. (2008). The Substance and Structure of Proportionality. *Public Law*, 694–716.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I010EBB7099A111DD9611E019A6BFBE26/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Hilson, C. (2002). Judicial Review, Policies and the Fettering of Discretion. *Public Law*, 111–129.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID10F7880E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Human Rights Act 1998.
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI5FB840F0E42311DAA7CF8F68F6EE57AB%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

In the Matter of an Application by Siobhan McLaughlin for Judicial Review (Northern Ireland) [2018] UKSC 48. (n.d.).
<https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2017-0035-judgment.pdf>

International Journal of Constitutional Law. (n.d.).
https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/16u3s8/alma997000681902671

Jackson & Ors v. Her Majesty's Attorney General [2005] UKHL 56.
<http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/2005/56.html>

Jackson & Ors v. Her Majesty's Attorney General [2005] UKHL 56.
<http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/2005/56.html>

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

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

Jones, B. C. (2016). Preliminary Warnings on 'Constitutional' Idolatry. *Public Law*, 74–92. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IE932C1D09A7F11E5ACC99E2443923C19/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Jowell, J. (1999). Of Vires and Vacuums: The Constitutional Context of Judicial Review. *Public Law*, 448–460. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID1392090E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

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

Kavanaugh, A. (2010). Defending Deference in Public Law and Constitutional Theory. *Law Quarterly Review*, 222. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IF3B510D22E5211DFBE2FA967ED04D069/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

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

Le Sueur, A. P., Sunkin, M., & Murkens, J. E. (2016). *Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (3rd Edition). Oxford University Press.

Le Sueur, A. P., Sunkin, M., & Murkens, J. E. (2019). *Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press. <http://doi.org.ezproxy01.rhul.ac.uk/10.1093/he/9780198820284.001.0001>

Legal Studies: The Journal of the Society of Legal Scholars. (n.d.). https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/16u3s8/alma997017693302671

Lever, A. (2007). Is Judicial Review Undemocratic? *Public Law*, 280–298. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I25BAEDE0E30911DB9628FD37664FF158/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Liversidge v Anderson [1941] UKHL 1. <http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/1941/1.html>

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

<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I849E17B0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Loveland, I. (2003). Does Homelessness Decision Making Engage Article 6(1) of the European Convention on Human Rights? *European Human Rights Law Review*, 176–204. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I7E856C70E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Loveland, I. (2015). Human Rights II: Emergent Principles. In *Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction* (7th Edition, pp. 588–615). Oxford University Press.

Loveland, I. (2018). Human Rights II: Emergent Principles. In *Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction* (8th edn). Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198804680.001.0001>

Loveland, I. (2021a). *Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction* (9th Edition). Oxford University Press.

Loveland, I. (2021b). *Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction* (9th Edition). Oxford University Press.

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

Mark Elliot: Reflections on the HS2 Case: A Hierarchy of Domestic Constitutional Norms and the Qualified Primacy of EU Law | UK Constitutional Law Association. (n.d.). <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/>

Masterman, R., & Murray, C. (2003). Law, Politics, and the United Kingdom Constitution. In *Exploring Constitutional and Administrative Law* (pp. 88–108). http://eu.alma.exlibrisgroup.com/view/action/uresolver.do?operation=resolveService&package_service_id=13409289760002671&institutionId=2671&customerId=2670

Masterman, R., & Murray, C. (2013). Law, Politics, and the United Kingdom Constitution. In *Exploring Constitutional and Administrative Law* (pp. 88–108). Pearson.

McLoughlin Supreme Court Press Summary. (n.d.). <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2017-0035-press-summary.pdf>

Miller & Anor, R (on the application of) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union (Rev 3) [2017] UKSC 5. <http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2017/5.html>

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

Nicol, D. (2006). Law and Politics After the Human Rights Act. *Public Law*, 722–751. <http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2F13579C41540511DB85F29853495F842F%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous>

%3Dtrue

Norris, M. (1996). *Ex Parte Smith: Irrationality and Human Rights*. *Public Law*, 590–600. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID37F6710E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Oliver, D. (1987). *Is the Ultra Vires Rule the Basis of Judicial Review?* *Public Law*, 543–569. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID3D7E750E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Olowofoyeku, A. A. (2000). *The Nemo Judex Rule: The Case Against Automatic Disqualification*. *Public Law*, 456–475. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID12EE760E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. (n.d.). https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/70508m/alma997001809702671

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

Phillipson, G. (n.d.-a). *'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/>

Phillipson, G. (n.d.-b). *"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/>

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

Poole, T. (2005). *Of Headscarves and Heresies: The Denbigh High School Case and Public Authority Decision-Making Under the Human Rights Act*. *Public Law*, 685–695. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I848A1A80E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

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

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

- Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee | UK Parliament. (n.d.). <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/public-administration-and-constitutional-affairs-committee/>
- Public Law. (n.d.). <https://uk.westlaw.com/WestlawUk/Journals/Publications/Public-Law>
- R (Chester) v Secretary of State for Justice [2013] UKSC 63. <http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2013/63.html>
- R (Evans) v Attorney General [2015] UKSC 21. <http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2015/21.html>
- R (Miller) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union [2017] UKSC 5, [40]-[49]. <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2016-0196.html>
- R (on the application of Nicklinson and another) (Appellants) v Ministry of Justice (Respondent) [2014] UKSC 38. <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2013-0235.html>
- Rainey, B., Wicks, E., & Ovey, C. (2014). Context, Background, and Institutions. In Jacobs, White and Ovey: The European Convention on Human Rights (6th Edition, pp. 3-20). Oxford University Press.
- Ringhand, L. (2005). Fig Leaves, Fairy Tales, and Constitutional Foundations: Debating Judicial Review in Britain. *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law*, 43(3). <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/cjtl43&id=1>
- Rivers, J. (2006). Proportionality and Variable Intensity of Review. *Cambridge Law Journal*, 65, 174-207. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IFB69CD50E72A11DC88EB9BE684C867E2/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>
- Sales, P. (2013). Rationality, Proportionality and the Development of the Law. *Law Quarterly Review*, 223-241. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I69812151881411E2BACCBED531DFD77E/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>
- Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018a). Judicial Review: Access to Review and Remedies. In *Public Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018b). Judicial Review: Access to Review and Remedies. In *Public Law*. Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>
- Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018c). Judicial Review: Illegality. In *Public law*. Oxford University Press.
- Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018d). Judicial Review: Illegality. In *Public Law*. Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>
- Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018e). Judicial Review: Irrationality and Proportionality. In *Public Law*. Oxford University Press.

Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018f). Judicial Review: Irrationality and Proportionality. In Public Law. Oxford University Press.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018g). Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. In Public Law. Oxford University Press.

Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018h). Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. In Public Law. Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018i). Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. In Public Law. Oxford University Press.

Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018j). Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. In Public Law. Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018k). Public Law. Oxford University Press.

Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018l). The Royal Prerogative and Constitutional Conventions. In Public Law. Oxford University Press.

Stanton, J., & Prescott, C. (2018m). The Royal Prerogative and Constitutional Conventions. In Public Law. Oxford University Press.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

Stanton, J., Prescott, C., & Mead, D. (2018). Public Law. Oxford University Press.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

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

<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI553CB880985E11E7BEB8FD7157D7F73E%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

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

<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I84ACE4C0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Taming the Prerogative: Strengthening Ministerial Accountability to Parliament. (2003). House of Commons. Public Administration Select Committee.

<https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpdocumentview?accountid=11455&groupid=103502&pgld=c5aea05f-b8ed-42b0-b2e6-8c68938d85ec>

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

<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI3A36A2305C5611E58916B963212E7CCD%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

- Taylor, R. B. (2015b). Foundational and Regulatory Conventions: Exploring the Constitutional Significance of Britain's Dependency Upon Conventions. *Public Law*, 614-632.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I3A36A2305C5611E58916B963212E7CCD/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>
- The Cambridge Law Journal. (n.d.).
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/cambridge-law-journal>
- The Constitution Unit Blog. (n.d.). <https://constitution-unit.com/>
- The Law Quarterly Review. (n.d.).
- The Modern Law Review. (n.d.).
https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/16u3s8/alma997003019902671
- Tomkins, A. (2002). In Defence of the Political Constitution. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 22(1), 157-175. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/22.1.157>
- Tomlinson and Others v Birmingham City Council [2010] UKSC 8. (n.d.-a).
<https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2009-0050-judgment.pdf>
- Tomlinson and Others v Birmingham City Council [2010] UKSC 8. (n.d.-b).
<https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2009-0050-judgment.pdf>
- Tomlinson, J. (2017). The Narrow Approach to Substantive Legitimate Expectations and the Trend of Modern Authority. *Oxford University Commonwealth Law Journal*, 17(1), 75-84.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14729342.2017.1311514>
- Turner, I. (2009). Irrationality, the Human Rights Act and the Limits of Merits-Review. *Nottingham Law Journal*, 18, 18-36.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IC5A4DCE02B5711E08221F700C27502AE/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>
- UK Constitutional Law Association Blog | International Association of Constitutional Law. (n.d.). <https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/blog/>
- UK Human Rights Blog. (n.d.). <https://ukhumanrightsblog.com/>
- UK Parliament. (n.d.). <http://www.parliament.uk/>
- Unmarried Mother Siobhan McLaughlin Wins Supreme Court Benefit Case | BBC. (2018).
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-45355028>
- Unmarried Mother Wins Supreme Court Fight for Widowed Parents' Allowance | Good Morning Britain | YouTube. (n.d.). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cs4viID3KWl>
- Varuhas, J. N. E. (2013a). The Reformation of English Administrative Law? "Rights", Rhetoric and Reality. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, 72(2), 369-413.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197313000500>

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

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

Walker, P. (1995). What's Wrong With Irrationality? *Public Law*, 556–576.
<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID3967180E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Watson, J. (2010). Clarity and Ambiguity: A New Approach to the Test of Legitimacy in the Law of Legitimate Expectations. *Legal Studies*, 30(4), 633–652.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-121X.2010.00177.x>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2015a). Human Rights. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials: Vol. Complete* (3rd Edition, pp. 255–290). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2015b). Human Rights. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials: Vol. Complete* (3rd Edition, pp. 255–290). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2015c). Parliamentary Supremacy: The Theory. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials: Vol. Complete* (3rd Edition, pp. 185–226). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2015d). The Crown Royal Perogative. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials: Vol. Complete* (3rd Edition, pp. 145–182). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2015e). The Role of Constitutional Conventions. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials: Vol. Complete* (3rd Edition, pp. 365–393). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2015f). The Rule of Law. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials: Vol. Complete* (3rd Edition, pp. 77–113). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018a). 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions and Roles' and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials: Vol. Complete* (3rd Edition, pp. 13–15). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018b). 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions and Roles' and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018c). Human Rights. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018d). Human Rights. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018e). Illegality. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (Fourth edition). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018f). Illegality. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018g). Irrationality and Proportionality. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (Fourth edition). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018h). Irrationality and Proportionality. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018i). Parliamentary Supremacy: The Theory. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018j). Procedural Impropriety. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (Fourth edition). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018k). Procedural Impropriety. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018l). Procedural Impropriety. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (Fourth edition). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018m). Procedural Impropriety. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018n). The Crown Royal Prerogative. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018o). The Role of Constitutional Conventions. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018p). The Role of Constitutional Conventions. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (Fourth edition). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018q). The Role of Constitutional Conventions. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018r). The Role of the Courts, Judicial Review, and Human Rights. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (Fourth edition). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018s). The Role of the Courts, Judicial Review, and Human

Rights. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018t). *The Rule of Law*. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018u). 'What is Public Law' and 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions, and Roles', and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials: Vol. Complete* (3rd Edition, pp. 3–76). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2018v). 'What is Public Law' and 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions, and Roles', and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. In *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (4th edn). Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2021a). *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (Fifth edition). Oxford University Press.

Webley, L., & Samuels, H. (2021b). *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (5th Edition). Oxford University Press. <https://doi-org.ezproxy01.rhul.ac.uk/10.1093/he/9780198853183.001.0001>

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

Williams, D. (2000). Bias; the Judges and the Separation of Powers. *Public Law*, 45–60. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID1246010E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Williams, R. (2017). Structuring Substantive Review. *Public Law*, 99–123. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IF32A9D40BAFC11E695A4FB481AEC10EF/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Wong, G. (2000). Towards the Nutcracker Principle: Reconsidering the Objections to Proportionality. *Public Law*, 92–109. <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID1301FE1E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

Young, A. L. (2011). Is Dialogue Working Under the Human Rights Act 1998? *Public Law*, 773–800. <http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FID7EAF690E23C11E080A9C399189E1576%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

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