

# LL1001: Public Law

View Online



---

1.

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

2.

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

3.

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

4.

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

5.

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

6.

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

7.

Alder, J., Syrett, K.: Constitutional and Administrative Law. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke (2017).

8.

Elliott, M., Thomas, R.: Public Law. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2017).

9.

Elliott, M., Thomas, R.: Public Law. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2017).

10.

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

11.

Le Sueur, A.P., Sunkin, M., Murkens, J.E.: Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2019).

12.

Public Law.

13.

Oxford Journal of Legal Studies.

14.

The Modern Law Review.

15.

International Journal of Constitutional Law.

16.

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

17.

The Law Quarterly Review.

18.

The Cambridge Law Journal.

19.

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

20.

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/>.

21.

Political and Constitutional Reform Committee | UK Parliament,  
<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,  
<https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/blog/>.

23.

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

24.

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

25.

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

26.

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

27.

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

28.

The Constitution Unit Blog, <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. pp. 3–76. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2018).

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. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2018).

31.

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

32.

Alder, J., Syrett, K.: Underlying Political Traditions. In: *Constitutional and Administrative Law*. pp. 26–54. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke (2017).

33.

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

34.

Elliot, M., Thomas, R.: Themes, Sources, and Principles. In: *Public Law*. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2017).

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*. pp. 13–15. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2018).

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*. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2018).

37.

*Liversidge v Anderson* [1941] UKHL 1.

38.

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

39.

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

40.

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

41.

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

42.

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

43.

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

44.

Murkens, J.E.K.: Democracy as the Legitimizing Condition in the UK Constitution. Legal Studies. 38, 42-58 (2018). <https://doi.org/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). (2015).

46.

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

47.

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

48.

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

49.

Webley, L., Samuels, H.: Parliamentary Supremacy: The Theory. In: *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials*. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2018).

50.

*British Railways Board v Pickin* [1974] AC 765.

51.

Elliott, M.: The Principle of Parliamentary Sovereignty in Legal, Constitutional, and Political Perspective. In: Jowell, J.L., Oliver, D., and O’Cinneide, C. (eds.) *The Changing Constitution*. pp. 38–66. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2015).

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

54.

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

55.

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

56.

Webley, L., Samuels, H.: *The Crown Royal Perogative*. In: *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials*. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2018).

57.

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

58.

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

59.

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

60.

*Taming the Prerogative: Strengthening Ministerial Accountability to Parliament*, <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. (2017).

62.

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

63.

Webley, L., Samuels, H.: The Role of Constitutional Conventions, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198798064.001.0001>, (2018).

64.

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

65.

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

66.

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/>.

67.

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/>.

68.

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

69.

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

70.

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

71.

Webley, L., Samuels, H.: *Human Rights*. In: *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials*. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2018).

72.

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

73.

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

74.

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

75.

Loveland, I.: *Human Rights II: Emergent Principles*. In: *Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Human Rights: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2018).

76.

Rainey, B., Wicks, E., Ovey, C.: Context, Background, and Institutions. In: Jacobs, White and Ovey: The European Convention on Human Rights. pp. 3–20. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2014).

77.

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

78.

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

79.

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

80.

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

81.

Human Rights Act 1998.

82.

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

83.

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

84.

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

85.

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

86.

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

87.

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

88.

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

89.

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

90.

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

91.

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

92.

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

93.

Alder, J., Syrett, K.: The Rule of Law. In: Constitutional and Administrative Law. pp. 121–137. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke (2017).

94.

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

95.

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

96.

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

97.

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

98.

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

99.

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

100.

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

101.

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

102.

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

103.

Phillipson, G.: '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/>.

104.

Phillipson, G.: "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/>.

105.

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

106.

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

107.

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

108.

Principles of Good Administration | Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO), <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*. 22, 157–175 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/22.1.157>.

110.

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

111.

Exercise of Discretion in Administrative Decision-Making, <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*. 428–447 (1999).

113.

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

114.

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

115.

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

116.

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

117.

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

118.

Elliott, M.: 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/>.

119.

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

120.



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

121.

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

122.

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

123.

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

124.

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

125.

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

126.

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

127.

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

128.

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

129.

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

130.

Webley, L., Samuels, H.: Illegality. In: *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and Materials*. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2018).

131.

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

132.

Stanton, J., Prescott, C.: Judicial Review: Illegality. In: *Public Law*. Oxford University Press, [Oxford] (2018).

133.

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

134.

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

135.

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

136.

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

137.

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

138.

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

139.

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

140.

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

141.

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

142.

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

143.

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

144.

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

145.

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

146.

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/>.

147.

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

148.

Elliott, M.: 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/>.

149.

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

150.

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

151.

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

152.

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

153.

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

154.

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

155.

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

156.

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

157.

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

158.

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

159.

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

160.

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

161.

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

162.

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

163.

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

164.

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

165.

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

166.

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

167.

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

168.

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

169.

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

170.

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

171.

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

172.

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

173.

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/>.

174.

Tomlinson and Others v Birmingham City Council [2010] UKSC 8,  
<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*. 71, 247–250 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197312000372>.

176.

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

177.

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

178.

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



179.

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

180.

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

181.

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

182.

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

183.

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

184.

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

185.

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

186.

Webley, L., Samuels, H.: Procedural Impropriety. In: *Complete Public Law: Text, Cases, and*

Materials. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2018).

187.

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

188.

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

189.

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

190.

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

191.

Ahmed, F., Perry, A.: The Coherence of the Doctrine of Legitimate Expectations. The Cambridge Law Journal. 73, 61-85 (2014). <https://doi.org/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. 30, 633-652 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-121X.2010.00177.x>.

193.

Craig, P., Schonberg, S.: Substantive Legitimate Expectations After Coughlan. Public Law.

684-701 (2000).

194.

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

195.

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

196.

Unmarried Mother Siobhan McLaughlin Wins Supreme Court Benefit Case | BBC, <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, <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, <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2017-0035-judgment.pdf>.

199.

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

200.

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

20Application.pdf.