

LL1001: Public Law

[View Online](#)

1.

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

2.

Webley L, Samuels H. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. 5th Edition. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2021. doi:10.1093/he/9780198853183.001.0001

3.

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

4.

Stanton J, Prescott C, Mead D. Public Law [Internet]. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

5.

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

6.

Loveland I. Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction. 9th Edition. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2021. doi:10.1093/he/9780198860129.001.0001

7.

Alder J, Syrett K. Constitutional and Administrative Law. 11th Edition. Palgrave Law Masters. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2017.

8.

Elliott M, Thomas R. Public Law. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2017.

9.

Elliott M, Thomas R. Public Law [Internet]. 3rd edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2017. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198765899.001.0001>

10.

Le Sueur AP, Sunkin M, Murkens JE. Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2016.

11.

Le Sueur AP, Sunkin M, Murkens JE. Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2019. Available from: <http://doi.org.ezproxy01.rhul.ac.uk/10.1093/he/9780198820284.001.0001>

12.

Public Law [Internet]. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/WestlawUk/Journals/Publications/Public-Law>

13.

Oxford Journal of Legal Studies [Internet]. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/70508m/alma997001809702671

14.

The Modern Law Review [Internet]. Available from:

https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/16u3s8/alma997003019902671

15.

International Journal of Constitutional Law [Internet]. Available from:

https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/16u3s8/alma997000681902671

16.

Legal Studies: The Journal of the Society of Legal Scholars [Internet]. Available from:

https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/16u3s8/alma997017693302671

17.

The Law Quarterly Review.

18.

The Cambridge Law Journal [Internet]. Available from:

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/cambridge-law-journal>

19.

Constitution Committee | UK Parliament [Internet]. Available from:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/lords-select/constitution-committee/>

20.

Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee | UK Parliament [Internet].

Available from:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/public-administration-and-constitutional-affairs-committee/>

21.

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

22.

UK Constitutional Law Association Blog | International Association of Constitutional Law [Internet]. Available from: <https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/blog/>

23.

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

24.

UK Parliament [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.parliament.uk/>

25.

British and Irish Legal Information Institute [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.bailii.org/>

26.

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

27.

UK Human Rights Blog [Internet]. Available from: <https://ukhumanrightsblog.com/>

28.

The Constitution Unit Blog [Internet]. Available from: <https://constitution-unit.com/>

29.

Webley L, Samuels H. '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. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2018. p. 3–76.

30.

Webley L, Samuels H. '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 [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

31.

Feldman D. None, One or Several? Perspectives on the UK's Constitution(s). The Cambridge Law Journal. 2005;64(2):329–51. doi:10.1017/S0008197305006884

32.

Alder J, Syrett K. Underlying Political Traditions. In: Constitutional and Administrative Law. 11th Edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2017. p. 26–54.

33.

Elliott M, Thomas R. Themes, Sources, and Principles. In: Public Law. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2017. p. 36–86.

34.

Elliott M, Thomas R. Themes, Sources, and Principles. In: Public Law [Internet]. 3rd edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2017. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198765899.001.0001>

35.

Webley L, Samuels H. 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions and Roles' and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2018. p. 13–5.

36.

Webley L, Samuels H. 'Constitutional Organisations, Institutions and Roles' and 'The Nature of the British Constitution'. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

37.

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

38.

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

39.

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

40.

R (on the application of Nicklinson and another) (Appellants) v Ministry of Justice (Respondent) [2014] UKSC 38 [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2013-0235.html>

41.

Ahmed F, Perry A. Constitutional Statutes. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 2016. doi:10.1093/ojls/gqw030

42.

Barber NW. Prelude to the Separation of Powers. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 2001;60(1):59–88. doi:10.1017/S0008197301000629

43.

Jones BC. Preliminary Warnings on 'Constitutional' Idolatry. *Public Law* [Internet]. 2016;74–92. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IE932C1D09A7F11E5ACC99E2443923C19/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

44.

Murkens JEK. Democracy as the Legitimizing Condition in the UK Constitution. *Legal Studies*. 2018;38(01):42–58. doi:10.1017/lst.2017.10

45.

Hale, Lady. '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 [Internet]. 2015. Available from: <https://www.supremecourt.uk/docs/speech-151008.pdf>

46.

Gee G, Webber GCN. What Is a Political Constitution? *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 2010;30(2):273–99. doi:10.1093/ojls/gqq013

47.

Gordon M. Parliamentary Sovereignty in the UK Constitution: Process, Politics and Democracy [Electronic resource]. v. 4. Oxford: Hart Publishing; 2015. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781474201667>

48.

Webley L, Samuels H. Parliamentary Supremacy: The Theory. In: *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials*. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015. p. 185–226.

49.

Webley L, Samuels H. Parliamentary Supremacy: The Theory. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

50.

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

51.

Elliott M. The Principle of Parliamentary Sovereignty in Legal, Constitutional, and Political Perspective. In: Jowell JL, Oliver D, O'Cinneide C, editors. The Changing Constitution. 8th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015. p. 38–66.

52.

Mark Elliot: Reflections on the HS2 Case: A Hierarchy of Domestic Constitutional Norms and the Qualified Primacy of EU Law | UK Constitutional Law Association [Internet]. Available from: <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/>

53.

Allan TRS. Constitutional Justice: A Liberal Theory of the Rule of Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005.

54.

Allan TRS. Constitutional Justice: A Liberal Theory of the Rule of Law [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199267880.001.0001>

55.

Webley L, Samuels H. The Crown Royal Perogative. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015. p. 145–82.

56.

Webley L, Samuels H. The Crown Royal Perogative. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

57.

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

58.

R (Miller) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union [2017] UKSC 5, [40]-[49] [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2016-0196.html>

59.

Daly P. Justiciability and the 'Political Question' Doctrine. Public Law [Internet]. 2010;160–78. Available from: <http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI14A4A19044F511E88D34E20E69C76312%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

60.

Taming the Prerogative: Strengthening Ministerial Accountability to Parliament [Internet]. House of Commons. Public Administration Select Committee; 2003. p. 3–17. Available from: <https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpdocumentview?accountid=11455&groupid=103502&pgId=c5aea05f-b8ed-42b0-b2e6-8c68938d85ec>

61.

Craig R. A Simple Application of the Frustration Principle: Prerogative, Statute and Miller. Public Law [Internet]. 2017. Available from:

<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI8106D680C87411E79CFEFF663275FD29%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

62.

Webley L, Samuels H. The Role of Constitutional Conventions. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015. p. 365–93.

63.

Webley L, Samuels H. The Role of Constitutional Conventions. Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

64.

Taylor RB. Foundational and Regulatory Conventions: Exploring the Constitutional Significance of Britain's Dependency Upon Conventions. Public Law [Internet]. 2015;614–32. Available from: <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>

65.

Attorney General v Jonathan Cape Ltd [1976] QB 752 [Internet]. Available from: <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>

66.

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

67.

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

68.

Jaconelli J. Do Constitutional Conventions Bind? The Cambridge Law Journal. 2005;64(1):149–76. doi:10.1017/S0008197305006823

69.

Barber NW. Laws and Constitutional Conventions. Law Quarterly Review [Internet]. 2009;125:294–309. Available from: <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>

70.

Webley L, Samuels H. Human Rights. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015. p. 255–90.

71.

Webley L, Samuels H. Human Rights. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

72.

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

73.

R (Chester) v Secretary of State for Justice [2013] UKSC 63 [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2013/63.html>

74.

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

75.

Loveland I. Human Rights II: Emergent Principles. In: Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction [Internet]. 8th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198804680.001.0001>

76.

Rainey B, Wicks E, Ovey C. Context, Background, and Institutions. In: Jacobs, White and Ovey: The European Convention on Human Rights. 6th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2014. p. 3–20.

77.

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

78.

Webley L, Samuels H. Human Rights. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015. p. 255–90.

79.

Webley L, Samuels H. Human Rights. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

80.

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

81.

Human Rights Act 1998 [Internet]. Available from:
<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>

82.

Stark SW. Facing Facts: Judicial Approaches to Section 4 of the Human Rights Act 1998. Law Quarterly Review [Internet]. 2017. Available from:
<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>

83.

Nicol D. Law and Politics After the Human Rights Act. Public Law [Internet]. 2006;722–51. Available from:
<http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI13579C41540511DB85F29853495F842F%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

84.

Young AL. Is Dialogue Working Under the Human Rights Act 1998? Public Law [Internet]. 2011;773–800. Available from:
<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>

85.

Clayton R. The Empire Strikes Back: Common Law Rights and the Human Rights Act. Public Law [Internet]. 2015;3-12. Available from: <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>

86.

Webley L, Samuels H. The Rule of Law. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015. p. 77-113.

87.

Webley L, Samuels H. The Rule of Law. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

88.

Craig P. Formal and Substantive Conceptions of the Rule of Law: An Analytical Framework. Public Law. 1997;467-87.

89.

Jowell J. Parliamentary Sovereignty Under the New Constitutional Hypothesis. Public Law. 2006;562-79.

90.

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

91.

R (Evans) v Attorney General [2015] UKSC 21 [Internet]. Available from:

<http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2015/21.html>

92.

Bingham TH. *The Rule of Law*. London: Penguin; 2011.

93.

Alder J, Syrett K. *The Rule of Law*. In: *Constitutional and Administrative Law*. 11th Edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2017. p. 121–37.

94.

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

95.

Masterman R, Murray C. *Law, Politics, and the United Kingdom Constitution*. In: *Exploring Constitutional and Administrative Law*. Harlow, England: Pearson; 2013. p. 88–108.

96.

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

97.

Elliott M. A Tangled Constitutional Web: The Black-Spider Memos and the British Constitution's Relational Architecture. *Public Law* [Internet]. 2015;539–50. Available from: <http://signon.thomsonreuters.com/federation/UKF?entityID=http%3A%2F%2Fidp.rhul.ac.uk%2Foala&returnto=https%3A%2F%2Fuk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com%2FDocument%2FI3A34F4805C5611E58916B963212E7CCD%2FView%2FFullText.html%3FskipAnonymous%3Dtrue>

98.

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

99.

Webley L, Samuels H. The Role of Constitutional Conventions. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

100.

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

101.

Stanton J, Prescott C. The Royal Prerogative and Constitutional Conventions. In: Public Law [Internet]. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

102.

Taylor RB. Foundational and Regulatory Conventions: Exploring the Constitutional Significance of Britain's Dependency Upon Conventions. Public Law [Internet]. 2015;614–32. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I3A36A2305C5611E58916B963212E7CCD/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

103.

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

104.

Phillipson G. "Historic" Commons' Syria Vote: The Constitutional Significance. Part II | the

Way Forward – UK Constitutional Law Association [Internet]. Available from: <https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/2013/11/29/gavin-phillipson-historic-commons-syria-vote-the-constitutional-significance-part-ii-the-way-forward/>

105.

Jaconelli J. Do Constitutional Conventions Bind? *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 2005;64(1):149–76. doi:10.1017/S0008197305006823

106.

Barber NW. Laws and Constitutional Conventions. *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. 2009;294–309. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I69EDD0210ACD11DE953BC0C525628E94/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

107.

Perry A, Tucker A. Top-Down Constitutional Conventions. *The Modern Law Review*. 2018;81(5):765–89. doi:10.1111/1468-2230.12364

108.

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

109.

Tomkins A. In Defence of the Political Constitution. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 2002;22(1):157–75. doi:10.1093/ojls/22.1.157

110.

Delegated Legislation | UK Parliament [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.parliament.uk/about/how/laws/delegated/>

111.

Exercise of Discretion in Administrative Decision-Making [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.ombudsman.wa.gov.au/Publications/Documents/guidelines/Exercise-of-discretion-in-admin-decision-making.pdf>

112.

Craig P. Competing Models of Judicial Review. Public Law [Internet]. 1999;428-47. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID132DF00E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

113.

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

114.

Webley L, Samuels H. The Role of the Courts, Judicial Review, and Human Rights. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

115.

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

116.

Stanton J, Prescott C. Judicial Review: Access to Review and Remedies. In: Public Law [Internet]. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

117.

Lever A. Is Judicial Review Undemocratic? Public Law [Internet]. 2007;280-98. Available

from:

https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_hal_primary_oai_HAL_hal_02506476v1

118.

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

119.

Arvind TT. The Curious Origins of Judicial Review. *Law Quarterly Review*. 2017;91-117.

120.

Craig P. Political Constitutionalism and the Judicial Role: A Response. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*. 2011;9(1):112-31. doi:10.1093/icon/mor025

121.

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

122.

Ringhand L. Fig Leaves, Fairy Tales, and Constitutional Foundations: Debating Judicial Review in Britain. *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* [Internet]. 2005;43(3). Available from: <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?public=false&handle=hein.journals/cjtl43&id=1>

123.

Allan TRS. Constitutional Dialogue and the Justification of Judicial Review. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* [Internet]. 2003;23(4). Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3600687>

124.

Forsyth C, Elliott M. The Legitimacy of Judicial Review. Public Law [Internet]. 2003;286–307. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_38487000

125.

Allan TRS. The Constitutional Foundations of Judicial Review: Conceptual Conundrum or Interpretative Inquiry? The Cambridge Law Journal. 2002;61(1):87–125. doi:10.1017/S000819730200154X

126.

Barber NW. Review: The Academic Mythologists. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies [Internet]. 2001;21(2). Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20468373>

127.

Lord Lester of Herne Hill. Developing Constitutional Principles of Public Law. Public Law [Internet]. 2001;684–94. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I849E17B0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

128.

Elliott M. The Demise of Parliamentary Sovereignty? the Implications for Justifying Judicial Review. Law Quarterly Review [Internet]. 1999;119–37. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ICCCA7BD0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

129.

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

130.

Webley L, Samuels H. Illegality. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials

[Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

131.

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

132.

Stanton J, Prescott C. Judicial Review: Illegality. In: Public Law [Internet]. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

133.

Hilson C. Judicial Review, Policies and the Fettering of Discretion. Public Law [Internet]. 2002;111–29. Available from:
https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_39102170

134.

Gregson R. When Should There Be an Implied Power to Delegate? Public Law [Internet]. 2017;408–25. Available from:
https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_1935799898

135.

Forsyth C. Of Fig Leaves and Fairy Tales: The Ultra Vires Doctrine, the Sovereignty of Parliament and Judicial Review. The Cambridge Law Journal. 1996;55(1):122–40. doi:10.1017/S0008197300097762

136.

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

137.

Oliver D. Is the Ultra Vires Rule the Basis of Judicial Review? Public Law [Internet]. 1987;543-69. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID3D7E750E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

138.

Knight CJS. A Framework for Fettering. Judicial Review. 2009;14(1):73-80. doi:10.1080/10854681.2009.11426590

139.

Jowell J. Of Vires and Vacuums: The Constitutional Context of Judicial Review. Public Law [Internet]. 1999;448-60. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_38772444

140.

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

141.

Webley L, Samuels H. Irrationality and Proportionality. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

142.

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

143.

Stanton J, Prescott C. Judicial Review: Irrationality and Proportionality. In: Public Law [Internet]. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

144.

Williams R. Structuring Substantive Review. Public Law [Internet]. 2017;99-123. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_1899767912

145.

Varuhas JNE. The Reformation of English Administrative Law? "Rights", Rhetoric and Reality. The Cambridge Law Journal. 2013;72(2):369-413. doi:10.1017/S0008197313000500

146.

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

147.

Kavanaugh A. Defending Deference in Public Law and Constitutional Theory. Law Quarterly Review [Internet]. 2010;222. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_1036008592

148.

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

149.

Young AL. Will You, Won't You, Will You Join the Deference Dance? Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 2014;34(2):375-94. doi:10.1093/ojls/gqu004

150.

Allan TRS. Judicial Deference and Judicial Review: Legal Doctrine and Legal Theory. *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. 2011;127(1). Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I38697650034411E088BDC597D432CBAC/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

151.

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

152.

Allan TRS. Human Rights and Judicial Review: A Critique of "Due Deference". *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 2006;65(3):671–95. doi:10.1017/S0008197306007264

153.

Walker P. What's Wrong With Irrationality? *Public Law* [Internet]. 1995;556–76. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID3967180E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

154.

Norris M. Ex Parte Smith: Irrationality and Human Rights. *Public Law* [Internet]. 1996;590–600. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_57696805

155.

Jowell J, Lester A. Beyond Wednesbury: Substantive Principles of Administrative Law. *Commonwealth Law Bulletin*. 1988;14(2):858–70. doi:10.1080/03050718.1988.9985971

156.

Chan C. A Preliminary Framework for Measuring Deference in Rights Reasoning.

International Journal of Constitutional Law. 2016;14(4):851–82. doi:10.1093/icon/mow058

157.

Varuhas JNE. The Reformation of English Administrative Law? "Rights", Rhetoric and Reality. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 2013;72(2):369–413. doi:10.1017/S0008197313000500

158.

Sales P. Rationality, Proportionality and the Development of the Law. *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. 2013;223–41. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I69812151881411E2BACCBED531DFD77E/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

159.

Craig P. The Nature of Reasonableness Review. *Current Legal Problems*. 2013;66(1):131–67. doi:10.1093/clp/cut010

160.

Poole T. The Reformation of English Administrative Law. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 2009;68(1):142–68. doi:10.1017/S0008197309000063

161.

Hickman T. The Substance and Structure of Proportionality. *Public Law* [Internet]. 2008;694–716. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I010EBB7099A111DD9611E019A6BFBE26/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

162.

Rivers J. Proportionality and Variable Intensity of Review. *Cambridge Law Journal* [Internet]. 2006;65:174–207. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/IFB69CD50E72A11DC88EB9BE684C867E2/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

163.

Poole T. Of Headscarves and Heresies: The Denbigh High School Case and Public Authority Decision-Making Under the Human Rights Act. *Public Law* [Internet]. 2005;685–95.

Available from:

<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I848A1A80E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

164.

Blake N. Importing Proportionality: Clarification or Confusion. *European Human Rights Law Review* [Internet]. 2002;19–27. Available from:

<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I84B178A0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

165.

Fenwick H. The Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001: A Proportionate Response to 11 September? *The Modern Law Review*. 2002;65(5):724–62.

doi:10.1111/1468-2230.00405

166.

Craig P. The Courts, the Human Rights Act and Judicial Review. *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. 2001;589–603. Available from:

<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I848E3930E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

167.

Wong G. Towards the Nutcracker Principle: Reconsidering the Objections to Proportionality. *Public Law* [Internet]. 2000;92–109. Available from:

<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/ID1301FE1E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

168.

Supperstone M, Coppel J. Judicial Review After the Human Rights Act. *European Human Rights Law Review* [Internet]. 1999;301–29. Available from:

<https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I84ACE4C0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText>

.html?skipAnonymous=true

169.

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

170.

Webley L, Samuels H. Procedural Impropriety. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

171.

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

172.

Stanton J, Prescott C. Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. In: Public Law [Internet]. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

173.

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

174.

Tomlinson and Others v Birmingham City Council [2010] UKSC 8 [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2009-0050-judgment.pdf>

175.

Elliott M. The Appearance of Bias, the Fair-Minded and Informed Observer, and the "Ordinary Person in Queen Square Market". *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 2012;71(2):247–50. doi:10.1017/S0008197312000372

176.

Tomlinson and Others v Birmingham City Council [2010] UKSC 8 [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2009-0050-judgment.pdf>

177.

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

178.

Craig P. The Human Rights Act, Article 6 and Procedural Rights. *Public Law* [Internet]. 2003;753–73. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I84890911E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

179.

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

180.

Olowofoyeku AA. The Nemo Judex Rule: The Case Against Automatic Disqualification. *Public Law* [Internet]. 2000;456–75. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_38919790

181.

Malleson K. Judicial Bias and Disqualification After Pinochet (No. 2). *Modern Law Review*. 2000;63(1):119–27. doi:10.1111/1468-2230.00254

182.

Williams D. Bias; the Judges and the Separation of Powers. Public Law [Internet]. 2000;45–60. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_38839088

183.

Atrill S. WHO IS THE "FAIR-MINDED AND INFORMED OBSERVER"? BIAS AFTER. The Cambridge Law Journal. 2003;62(2):279–89. doi:10.1017/S0008197303006317

184.

Le Sueur AP. Legal Duties to Give Reasons. Current Legal Problems. 1999;52(1):150–72. doi:10.1093/clp/52.1.150

185.

Campbell NR. The Duty to Give Reasons in Administrative Law. Public Law [Internet]. 1994;184–91. Available from: https://librarysearch.royalholloway.ac.uk/permalink/44ROY_INST/93uiap/cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_57421405

186.

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

187.

Webley L, Samuels H. Procedural Impropriety. In: Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials [Internet]. 4th edn. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>

188.

Stanton J, Prescott C. Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. In: Public Law. Oxford:

Oxford University Press; 2018.

189.

Stanton J, Prescott C. Judicial Review: Procedural Impropriety. In: Public Law [Internet]. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press; 2018. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198722939.001.0001>

190.

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

191.

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

192.

Watson J. Clarity and Ambiguity: A New Approach to the Test of Legitimacy in the Law of Legitimate Expectations. *Legal Studies*. 2010;30(4):633–52. doi:10.1111/j.1748-121X.2010.00177.x

193.

Craig P, Schonberg S. Substantive Legitimate Expectations After Coughlan. *Public Law [Internet]*. 2000;684–701. Available from: <https://uk.westlaw.com/Document/I84A4F580E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A/View/FullText.html?skipAnonymous=true>

194.

Elliott M. Legitimate Expectations: Procedure, Substance, Policy and Proportionality. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 2006;65(2):254–6. doi:10.1017/S0008197306227119

195.

Bamforth N. Fairness and Legitimate Expectation in Judicial Review. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 1997;56(1):1-4. doi:10.1017/S0008197300017530

196.

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

197.

Unmarried Mother Wins Supreme Court Fight for Widowed Parents' Allowance | Good Morning Britain | YouTube [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cs4viID3KWI>

198.

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

199.

McLoughlin Supreme Court Press Summary [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2017-0035-press-summary.pdf>

200.

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