

PRESENTER



Francis Cooke QC, Thorndon Chambers, Wellington

Francis is one of New Zealand's leading public law lawyers. He has argued a number of significant judicial review cases before the higher courts acting for both applicants for judicial review and public bodies defending such challenges. Recent examples include the leading Supreme Court cases involving the Wellington Airport extension, and the proposed Ruataniwha dam.

He provides advice to a range of Crown agencies whose powers are subject to challenge as well as persons seeking to challenge such powers. He has also been involved in a number of important public inquiries, including leading the Auditor General's inquiry into a citizenship decision made by the Hon Shane Jones, and acting for the Hon Judith Collins in the inquiry into her conduct.

In addition to the public law focus of his practice, Francis is involved in significant commercial litigation, including litigation involving public bodies, and has again appeared in a number of leading commercial cases.

He has long experience as a barrister having commenced practice as a junior barrister in 1993 after periods with major law firms in the UK and New Zealand. He was appointed silk at the age of 38 in 2004.

Cover and text stocks used in this publication are from Forestry Stewardship Council certified mills, manufactured under the environmentally responsible paper manufactured environmental management system ISO 14001, using pulp from well managed forests and other controlled sources.

CONTENTS

1. WHAT IS JUDICIAL REVIEW?	1
2. THE KEY CONCEPT	5
IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW	5
FAIRLY.....	6
REASONABLY.....	7
BRINGING THE GROUNDS TOGETHER: THE WHOLE SHEBANG.....	9
3. THE PLACE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW IN NEW ZEALAND’S CONSTITUTION	11
JUDICIAL REVIEW MORE LIMITED	11
CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES.....	14
4. MISLEADING CONCEPTS	19
FIRST MISLEADING CONCEPT: JUDICIAL REVIEW IS NOT THE SAME AS AN APPEAL	19
SECOND MISLEADING CONCEPT: THE COURT CANNOT SUBSTITUTE ITS VIEW FOR THAT OF THE DECISION-MAKER	21
THIRD MISLEADING CONCEPT: INTENSITY OF REVIEW.....	22
FOURTH MISLEADING CONCEPT: JUDICIAL ACTIVISM.....	25
FIFTH MISLEADING CONCEPT(S): NULLITY, JURISDICTION AND OTHER ARCANE LANGUAGE	27
5. USE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW BY INTEREST GROUPS FOR TACTICAL ADVANTAGE.	31
6. THE GROUNDS FOR REVIEW IN GREATER DETAIL	33
ILLEGALITY (ACTING OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE POWER)	33
<i>Error of law</i>	34
<i>Improper purpose</i>	34
<i>Relevant/irrelevant considerations</i>	36
<i>Mistake of fact</i>	37
<i>Rigid application of pre-determined policy</i>	38
<i>Acting under dictation</i>	39
<i>Invalid delegation</i>	40
<i>Ultra vires regulations</i>	40
UNFAIRNESS/PROCEDURAL PROPRIETY	40
<i>Natural justice</i>	41
<i>Consultation/legitimate expectation</i>	42
<i>Bias</i>	44
UNREASONABLENESS/SUBSTANTIVE UNFAIRNESS/THE INNOMINATE GROUND	45
7. AVOIDING SUCCESSFUL JUDICIAL REVIEW – THE BENEFIT OF GOOD PROCEDURES	47
THE LAW SHOULD COME FIRST.....	47
EFFECTIVE CONSULTATION WHICH FULFILS THE DUTY TO ACT FAIRLY.....	48
GETTING THE PAPERWORK RIGHT	49
THE ROLE OF THE LEGAL ADVISER.....	50
A “GOOD PROCESS” MODEL.....	50
8. THE COURT PROCESS – SUMMARY	53
9. JUDICIAL REVIEW: HOW TO DO IT	55
RECOMMENDED PRIMARY RESOURCES.....	55
<i>Procedure</i>	55
<i>Substantive law</i>	55
KICKING OFF: THE PLEADINGS.....	55
<i>Justiciability</i>	55
<i>Assessing the sufficiency of your information</i>	55
<i>Jurisdiction</i>	56
<i>Intitlment</i>	56
<i>Parties</i>	57
STATEMENT OF CLAIM	58

<i>Parties</i>	59
<i>Governing instrument</i>	59
<i>Subject matter</i>	59
<i>Sequence of events</i>	60
<i>Decision subject to review</i>	60
<i>Grounds for relief</i>	60
<i>Remedy</i>	60
WHAT ELSE TO FILE?.....	61
<i>Notice of proceeding</i>	61
<i>Supporting affidavits</i>	61
STATEMENT OF DEFENCE.....	61
SERVICE	61
APPLICATION FOR INTERIM ORDERS	62
INTERLOCUTORY PROCEDURES.....	62
EVIDENCE	63
PROCEDURE AT HEARING.....	64
OUTCOME	66
10. APPENDIX A	67
DECISION-MAKING CHECKLISTS.....	67
11. APPENDIX B	69
TABLE COMPARING INTERLOCUTORY PROCEDURES: S 14(2) JRP AND HIGH COURT RULES	69
12. APPENDIX C	73
PRECEDENTS	73
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	73
13. APPENDIX D	87
JUDICIAL REVIEW PROCEDURE ACT 2016.....	87