

PRESENTERS



Francis Cooke QC, 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 decisions in *Quake Outcasts* and *New Zealand Pork Industry Association*.

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 in recent years 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 late last year.

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.....	8
3. THE PLACE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW IN NEW ZEALAND’S CONSTITUTION	11
JUDICIAL REVIEW MORE LIMITED	11
CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES	13
4. MISLEADING CONCEPTS	17
FIRST MISLEADING CONCEPT: JUDICIAL REVIEW IS NOT THE SAME AS AN APPEAL.....	17
SECOND MISLEADING CONCEPT: THE COURT CANNOT SUBSTITUTE ITS VIEW FOR THAT OF THE DECISION-MAKER	18
THIRD MISLEADING CONCEPT: INTENSITY OF REVIEW	20
FOURTH MISLEADING CONCEPT: JUDICIAL ACTIVISM	22
FIFTH MISLEADING CONCEPT(S): NULLITY, JURISDICTION AND OTHER ARCANE LANGUAGE.....	24
5. USE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW BY INTEREST GROUPS FOR TACTICAL ADVANTAGE. 27	
6. THE GROUNDS FOR REVIEW IN GREATER DETAIL	29
ILLEGALITY (ACTING OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE POWER)	29
<i>Error of law</i>	30
<i>Improper purpose</i>	30
<i>Relevant/irrelevant considerations</i>	31
<i>Mistake of fact</i>	33
<i>Rigid application of pre-determined policy</i>	34
<i>Acting under dictation</i>	34
<i>Invalid delegation</i>	35
<i>Ultra vires regulations</i>	35
UNFAIRNESS/PROCEDURAL PROPRIETY	36
<i>Natural justice</i>	36
<i>Consultation/Legitimate Expectation</i>	38
<i>Bias</i>	39
UNREASONABLENESS/SUBSTANTIVE UNFAIRNESS/THE INNOMINATE GROUND.....	41
7. AVOIDING SUCCESSFUL JUDICIAL REVIEW -THE BENEFIT OF GOOD PROCEDURES	43
THE LAW SHOULD COME FIRST.....	43
EFFECTIVE CONSULTATION WHICH FULFILS THE DUTY TO ACT FAIRLY	44
GETTING THE PAPERWORK RIGHT	45
THE ROLE OF THE LEGAL ADVISER	46
A “GOOD PROCESS” MODEL	46
8. THE COURT PROCESS - SUMMARY	49
9. JUDICIAL REVIEW: HOW TO DO IT	51
RECOMMENDED PRIMARY RESOURCES.....	51
<i>Procedure</i>	51
<i>Substantive law</i>	51
KICKING OFF: THE PLEADINGS.....	51
<i>Justiciability</i>	51
<i>Assessing the sufficiency of your information</i>	51
<i>Jurisdiction</i>	52
<i>Intitulent</i>	52
<i>Parties</i>	53
STATEMENT OF CLAIM	54

<i>Parties</i>	55
<i>Governing instrument</i>	55
<i>Subject matter</i>	55
<i>Sequence of events</i>	56
<i>Decision subject to review</i>	56
<i>Grounds for relief</i>	56
<i>Remedy</i>	56
WHAT ELSE TO FILE?.....	57
<i>Notice of proceeding</i>	57
<i>Supporting affidavits</i>	57
STATEMENT OF DEFENCE	57
SERVICE	57
APPLICATION FOR INTERIM ORDERS	58
INTERLOCUTORY PROCEDURES	58
EVIDENCE	59
PROCEDURE AT HEARING	60
OUTCOME	62
10. APPENDIX A	63
DECISION-MAKING CHECKLISTS.....	63
11. APPENDIX B	65
TABLE COMPARING INTERLOCUTORY PROCEDURES : s 10(2) JAA AND HIGH COURT RULES.....	65
12. APPENDIX C	69
PRECEDENTS	69
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	69
13. APPENDIX D	83
JUDICATURE AMENDMENT ACT 1972	83