

PRESENTERS



Chris Curran, Crown Law Office, Wellington

Chris is an Associate Crown Counsel in the Human Rights team. He has an LLB(Hons) and BA from Otago University and BCL and MPhil (both with distinction) from Oxford University. A former clerk to Justice Blanchard in the Court of Appeal, Chris joined Crown Law in 2004. He has appeared in a range of litigation in the District Court, High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court.



Dean Knight, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Victoria University of Wellington & Associate Director, New Zealand Centre for Public Law

Dean's scholarly interests are public and administrative law, particularly judicial review, along with local government and local democracy. He was a presenter of the NZLS seminar Liability of Local Authorities 2005. He is the joint Editor-in-Chief of the New Zealand Journal of Public and International Law. Before joining the faculty, Dean spent eight years with Phillips Fox as part of its litigation, environment and public law teams.



Dr Geoff McLay, Reader in Law at Victoria University of Wellington and International Research Fellow, New Zealand Law Foundation

Geoff was one of the presenters of the 2004 and 2005 seminars on liability of public/local authorities. He has recently completed a doctorate on Crown liability at the University of Michigan. Geoff's current research, supported by the New Zealand Law Foundation as its International Research Fellow 2006, focuses on how government responds to being sued.

Acknowledgement

Geoff McLay acknowledges the support of the New Zealand Law Foundation, which has supported his research as its International Research Fellow 2006.

Parts of the chapter on Government Negligence have been previously published in Geoff McLay "The New Zealand Supreme Court, the *Couch* case and the Future of Government Liability" (2009) 17 Torts Law Journal 77. It is reprinted in this booklet with permission.

The statements and conclusions contained in this booklet are those of the author(s) only and not those of the New Zealand Law Society. This booklet has been prepared for the purpose of a Continuing Legal Education course. It is not intended to be a comprehensive statement of the law or practice, and should not be related upon as such. If advice on the law is required, it should be sought on a formal, professional basis.

CONTENTS

1. PUBLIC LIABILITY REVISITED	1
A REVOLUTION THAT WASN'T?	1
THE EQUALITY PRINCIPLE AS A CENTRAL THEME	1
<i>The importance of the equality principle</i>	2
<i>The continued power of the principle</i>	3
<i>The Crown Proceedings Act, the equality principle and the social welfare and regulatory state</i>	3
<i>The continued importance of the vicarious model</i>	5
LIMITING THE REVOLUTION	7
<i>Retraction in Negligence</i>	7
<i>The Fate of Misfeasance</i>	7
SEEDS OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS.....	8
<i>The Prospects of Liability in Negligence Couch and the Leaky Buildings cases</i>	8
<i>The Effect of United Kingdom Human Rights Act Jurisprudence</i>	9
<i>Possibility of reform?</i>	10
<i>Public really means Public?</i>	11
2. GOVERNMENT NEGLIGENCE	13
INTRODUCTION	13
THE DUTY QUESTION.....	13
<i>How to find a duty</i>	13
<i>Limiting government negligence law</i>	19
<i>Preparation for court proceedings</i>	24
<i>Gross rather than mere negligence?</i>	25
<i>The general reliance theory</i>	26
<i>Specific Vulnerability – an acceptable halfway house?</i>	28
NEGLIGENCE, BREACH OF STATUTORY DUTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW	31
<i>Introduction</i>	31
<i>Pranfield v Minister of Fisheries</i>	32
LEAKY BUILDINGS AND BUILDING SAFETY	35
<i>Liability of territorial authorities for building inspections</i>	35
<i>Non-liability of the Building Industry Authority</i>	39
PLANNING AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	40
<i>Introduction</i>	40
<i>Bella Vista: Craig distinguished (and doubted?)</i>	42
<i>Some parts of the process may not be subject to the immunity: pre-decision representations</i>	44
DISCLOSURE OF OFFICIAL INFORMATION.....	45
<i>General “good faith” immunity provisions</i>	45
<i>Land Information Memoranda: a magnet for liability</i>	46
OBLIGATION TO PROTECT PEOPLE	50
<i>Couch: a rare opportunity not taken</i>	50
<i>The Court’s limited holding</i>	53
<i>Could there be a duty of care?</i>	55
<i>Exemplary damages: still to be decided</i>	60
3. MISFEASANCE IN PUBLIC OFFICE	71
INTRODUCTION	71
THE “MISFIT TORT”	71
<i>The Rediscovery of the tort</i>	72
<i>Clark J’s elements</i>	74
<i>The exercise of power as a public officer: negligence is not enough</i>	75
<i>Forseeability of harm as a control mechanism</i>	75
<i>The defendant’s state of mind, recklessness as to the legality and the bar on administrative law damages</i>	77
MISFEASANCE AND THE RULE OF LAW INTEREST.....	78
<i>The Rule of Law Interest</i>	78

<i>Watkins: The Limits of History</i>	79
<i>What about the privacy interest? Why restrict recovery to financial loss?</i>	81
<i>The Public Nature of Public Law</i>	82
CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE OF TORT AS A WAY OF DELIVERING HUMAN RIGHTS	84
4. THE BILL OF RIGHTS ACT: LIABILITY AND REMEDIES	85
INTRODUCTION	85
PART I: LIABILITY DEVELOPMENTS	86
LIABILITY FOR ILL-TREATMENT BY THE STATE	86
<i>Taunoa v Attorney-General</i>	86
<i>The right against torture or cruel treatment (s 9 of the Bill of Rights Act)</i>	88
<i>The right to be treated with humanity and respect for the inherent dignity of the person (s 23(5) of the Bill of Rights Act)</i>	90
<i>Conclusions</i>	91
PROTECTIVE OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE RIGHT TO LIFE	91
<i>The genesis of positive protective obligations under art 2 ECHR</i>	91
<i>The duty to protect persons from the criminal acts of third parties</i>	92
<i>Duties to protect particular persons from self-harm</i>	96
<i>Positive duties to protect life under the ICCPR</i>	98
<i>Protecting life under the Bill of Rights Act: will ECHR jurisprudence be lost in translation?</i>	99
<i>Further complications with litigating a positive obligation to protect life in New Zealand</i>	101
<i>The duty to investigate loss of life</i>	103
THE SCOPE FOR BILL OF RIGHTS ACT-BASED PROTECTION OF PROPERTY INTERESTS	106
<i>Jain v Trent Strategic Health Authority: protection of property interests under the HRA 1998</i>	106
<i>Protection of property interests against unfair decision-making in New Zealand (s 27(1) of the Bill of Rights Act)</i>	109
<i>Protection of property interests against search and seizure (s 21 of the Bill of Rights Act)</i>	111
<i>Legislative amendment of the Bill of Rights Act?</i>	113
PART II: REMEDIAL DEVELOPMENTS	114
GOVERNING REMEDIAL PRINCIPLES UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS ACT	114
<i>An effective remedy</i>	114
<i>An appropriate remedy</i>	118
<i>A proportionate remedy</i>	118
THE PRESENT STATE OF THE REMEDY OF BILL OF RIGHTS ACT DAMAGES	120
<i>When Bill of Rights Act damages will be awarded</i>	120
<i>Determining the quantum of Bill of Rights Act damages</i>	122
AWARDS OF COSTS AND INTEREST IN BILL OF RIGHTS ACT LITIGATION	124
CONCLUSIONS	125
5. CASE STUDIES	127
VAN COLLE V CHIEF CONSTABLE OF HERTFORDSHIRE [2008] UKHL 50	127
TRENT STRATEGIC HEALTH AUTHORITY V JAIN [2009] UKHL 4	133
MITCHELL V GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL [2009] UKHL 11	139