

11KBW

ROLLING JUDICIAL REVIEW

James Goudie QC

WHAT IS “ ROLLING “ JUDICIAL REVIEW? **11KBW**

- Rolling Judicial Review is an approach to JR where a FRESH DECISION which has arisen AFTER the original challenge is sought to be ADDED to that challenge by way of an amendment of it
- The “ trend” has been “ deprecated” by the Court of Appeal
 - R (Spahiu) v SSHD (2018) EWCA Civ 2064, (2019) 1 WLR 1297, at paras 60-63
 - R (Dolan) v SoS for Health (2020) EWCA Civ1605, at paragraph 118

THE COURT'S APPROACH

11KBW

- There is no hard and fast rule
- BUT it will USUALLY be better if JR proceedings are NOT treated as “rolling” or “evolving”
- Dolan was precisely the kind of case in which a rolling JR should not be brought
- Not appropriate where issues turn on the state of the evidence at a particular time

THE APPROACH DEVELOPED

11KBW

- Rolling JR has been considered by Fordham J in R (Ali Raja) v Redbridge LBC (2020) EWHC 1456 (Admin), at paras 18-21 inc
- Rolling JR -
- Can, in some cases, such as Ali Raja, be “ entirely appropriate”
- IF approached with “ care and discipline”
- Discipline may include “ focus” on a specific decision

THE DYNAMIC REALITY

11KBW

- A claimant may however seek something other than or more than a quashing order
- A claimant may impugn inaction or a failure or refusal
- A claimant may seek a mandatory remedy
- The conduct under challenge, and the alleged default, may be of a CONTINUING nature
- The touchstones are-
 - Flexibility
 - Fairness to all the parties
 - Securing, and not undermining, the interests of justice
- Cases are infinitely different

DECISION-MAKING PROCES

11KBW

- Sometimes a defendant public authority is functus once it has made a decision and lacks jurisdiction to reconsider
- But more usually the authority has ONGOING FUNCTIONS and is able to react, review and reconsider
- “ It is important that they should”
- Open-mindedness is a virtue, not least with respect to representations
- Circumstances can change/proceedings should be avoided
- If a new decision is made adverse to the claimant, it may be appropriate for the original grounds to be amended to challenge it

EVOLVING JUDICIAL REVIEW

11KBW

- Rolling JR is concerned with –
 - amendment of proceedings to add challenge to later decision, and
 - the breadth of the evidence admissible on the issue of whether the defendant has made an unlawful decision
- If a decision is found to have been unlawful and the question arises of remedy/relief, the that will be influenced by what has happened since the decision
- For example, in R (Latif) v SoS for Justice (2021) EWHC 892 (Admin) at paras 47 & 60/61, representations having been taken into account since the initial flawed decision, in a way and to an extent that overtook the error in that decision, in order to address what had gone wrong :-
 - It was not necessary to quash the decision, and
 - A declaration would be sufficient.

PREMATURITY

- R (3 Million Ltd ' v SSHD (2021) EWHC 1159 (Admin)
- Challenge to adoption of policy : rejected as premature
- Policy not yet in operation, albeit date set : policy not in final,form; impact could not be known; continuing process of decision-making and potential modification
- All claims premature : PSED, indirect discrimination, irrationality, proportionality

“Barristers of the very highest quality”

Legal 500

11KBW is renowned for the outstanding quality of its advice, advocacy and client service. Our barristers are experts in Public, Employment and Commercial Law and lead the field in a number of specialist areas.

“The clerks are absolutely fantastic; they are approachable, friendly and they deliver on time.”

Chambers & Partners

Please get in touch with our team to discuss what you need:

Joint Senior Clerks – Lucy Barbet & Mark Dann
Director of Business Development – Andrea Kennedy
Director of Finance and Administration – Claire Halas

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7632 8500

Email: clerksroom@11kbw.com

Address: 11 King's Bench, London EC4Y 7EQ

