

Administrative Law notes

Table of Contents

Contents

1. Administrative Law – Theory, History and Context	8
Introduction to Administrative Law	8
Dichotomies in Administrative Law Theory	8
Judicial regulation vs legislative / executive autonomy	8
Intervention vs restraint: red light / green light	8
Individualism vs collectivism	8
Rule-based justice v substantive justice	10
Legal vs non-legal paradigms	10
Managerialism and results vs governing by the rules	11
Evolution vs prescription	11
Public vs private	12
Accountability	13
Accountability as a legislative goal	13
Perspectives on accountability	14
Forms of accountability	16
Political accountability	16
Financial accountability	17
Administrative law accountability	18
Administrative law values	19
2. Overview of Australian Administrative Law and administrative decision making	21
Administrative Law in the Australian environment	21
The reforms of the ‘new administrative law’	21
Kerr Report	21
Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977 (Cth)	22
Establishing a single, simple procedure for judicial review	22
Establishing a right to reasons	25
Codifying the grounds of review	27
Administrative Appeals Tribunal	28
Commonwealth Ombudsman	29
Government information: Freedom of information and privacy	29
A comprehensive system of administrative responsibility	29
The rise and rise of the Constitution	30
Constitution, common law and statute	32
3. Rule-making and Control of Subordinate Legislation	33
The Role and Importance of subordinate legislation	33
The nature of subordinate legislation	33
Forms of subordinate legislation and statutory instruments	35
The disallowance of legislative instruments	37
4. Executive Policies, Directions and Representations	38
The role of Policy in government administration	38
The meaning of policy	39
Policies and decisions	39
Policies and legislative instruments / soft law	40
Discretion vs policy: a clash of values?	41
Discretion	42

5. Merits Review	45
The legality/merits distinction in courts and tribunals	45
Merits review tribunals	46
Administrative tribunals – Their nature, role, structure and relationship to government	49
Categorising administrative tribunals	49
State and territory tribunal systems	51
Appeal framework	52
Tribunals in the system of government	52
The Tribunal framework in New South Wales	53
Integration of Commonwealth, state and territory administrative review schemes	54
Appeals	54
Tribunal independence of government	55
Tribunal membership and panels	57
Qualifications of tribunal members	57
Administrative tribunals – The scope of the jurisdiction to undertake merits review	57
Standing in the Administrative Appeals Tribunal	59
Joint Standing	61
6. Merits Review – The Concept and Scope	62
Merits review – refining the concept	67
Concepts	67
Restrictions	67
Scope	67
Merits review – Contemporaneous review	67
Procedure and evidence – Their role in merits review by Administrative Tribunals	69
Tribunal procedures generally	69
Evidence, fact-finding and onus of proof	70
Adversarial v inquisitorial adjudication	72
Administrative Tribunals and Government Policy	72
Credibility assessment	73
7. Judicial Review: Jurisdiction and Justiciability	75
The Constitutional Framework	75
The Constitutional Framework – Rule of law	75
Rule of law – Limitation on the coercive action	75
Rule of law – Legal equality	75
Rule of law – Protection of civil liberties	76
The Constitutional Framework – Separation of powers	76
The Constitutional Framework – Responsible government	76
The Constitutional Framework – Constitutionalism	77
The Framework for Judicial Review	77
Commentaries on the framework for judicial review	78
The Judicial Review Framework in Each Australian Jurisdiction	78
Judicial Review at Common Law	78
Judicial Review under Statutory Schemes	79
Indirect Judicial Review	79
Judicial Review at Commonwealth – Federal Court	79
Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977 (Cth)	80
Judiciary Act 1903 (Cth)	81
Jurisdictional limitations of Judiciary Act 1903 (Cth)	82
Judicial Review at Commonwealth – the High Court’s original jurisdiction	83
Judicial Review in NSW	86

Justiciability	86
Commentaries on Justiciability	87
Justiciability in Law	88
Jurisdictional Limitations on Judicial Review	93
Jurisdiction under the ADJR Act	93
‘Decision’ and ‘Conduct’	94
‘[D]ecision... of an Administrative Character’	97
‘[D]ecision... made... under an enactment’	99
8. Standing in Judicial Review	105
Introduction to Standing	105
The Role of Standing in Public Law Litigation	105
The case for restricting standing in public law litigation	105
The case against restricting standing in public law litigation	107
The Interrelationship of Standing and Other Public Law Principles	108
Standing – Foundation Cases	108
High Court Decisions on Standing	108
Other illustrative decisions on Standing	111
Remedies Under the ADJR Act	114
Open Standing	115
Special Issues (of standing)	116
The Role of the Attorney-General	116
Joinder and Amicus Curiae	116
9. Acting Without Power	117
Unauthorised Decision-Making: General Principles	117
Identifying the source of legal authority for government action	117
Foundation Cases on unauthorised Decision-Making	118
Unauthorised Decision-Making: Relevant Principles of Statutory Construction	121
Statutory Construction and Public Law	121
Statutory Construction and Public Law - the Language of the Statute	121
The Nature of the Subject Matter Being Regulated and Interests Apt to be Affected	122
Beneficial Construction	122
The Nature of the Power Being Exercised	122
The Nature of the Decision-Maker	122
Interpretation Statutes	123
Extrinsic Materials	123
Delegation	124
Who is authorised to make a decision?	124
How can the Minister/Senior Official get help in making decisions?	125
The <i>Carltona</i> Doctrine	126
Agent or Adviser?	126
Unauthorised Decision-Making: The Decision-Maker	127
Categories of authorised decision-maker	127
Delegation and Agency – Some Refinements and Special Issues	131
10. Fact Finding Errors	131
Evidence, Probative Evidence and Administrative Fact-Finding	131
Probative Evidence Rule	132
Judicial Review of Fact-Finding Errors	133
Other grounds for judicial review that have been applied to fact-finding errors include	134
The jurisdictional (or objective) fact concept	135

11. Judicial Review and Statutory Interpretation	140
When Natural Justice Applies	142
The Hearing Rule – General Tests	144
Common Law Implication of natural justice	145
Legislative Implication of natural justice	145
Universal Implication of natural justice	145
Implication of natural justice from Multiple Factors	145
Example factors that may exclude presumption were identified by the HC in Miah	146
12. Procedural Fairness: The Hearing Rule	155
The Right or Interest Affected by a Decision	155
Legitimate Expectation (procedural fairness)	156
The Hearing Rule – Content	163
Classic Principles About the Content of the Hearing Rule	163
Factors that may determine content requirements	163
Commonality and Differences with Implication	163
When Relief is Awarded for Breach of NJ	163
Specific Principles Concerning the Content of the Hearing Rule	165
Outline of the content element of the hearing rule	165
Prior Notice Requirement	165
Disclosure of an Outline of the Case	165
Who should conduct the hearing?	168
Conduct of the hearing: oral hearing or written submissions	168
Oral hearing: legal representation	168
Cross-Examination	169
Duty to make inquiries or assist parties	169
Bias (Moodle online content)	169
Bias in Administrative Decision Making	172
The Rule Against Bias	176
Categories of Bias	177
Decision-maker’s private communication with a party	178
Decision-maker is both prosecutor and a judge	178
Decision-maker holds prejudicial views	178
Decision-maker rehears the same matter on appeal	178
Decision-maker has made interlocutory decisions in the same proceedings	178
Decision-maker exhibits animosity or partiality	178
Decision-maker has a close connection with party	178
Other circumstances in which bias might arise	179
Test for Prejudgment	179
Exceptions to Prejudgment	180
13. Discretion and Errors 1: Purpose and Considerations	181
Acting for an Unauthorised Purpose	181
Authorised Statutory Purpose	181
Actual Purpose of the Decision	183
Multiple Purposes (Acting for an Unauthorised Purpose)	183
Considering Irrelevant Matters	185
Criteria of Relevance (Considering Irrelevant Matters)	185
Matters That Were Considered (Considering Irrelevant Matters)	186
Evidence of an Irrelevant Consideration	188
Effect of an Unauthorised Purpose or Irrelevant Consideration	188
Failing to Consider Relevant Matters	188

Obligation to Consider Relevant Matters	189
Failure to Consider Relevant matters	189
Other Issues (Failing to Consider Relevant Matters)	190
14. Discretion and Reasoning Errors 2: Policies	195
The Role of Policy in Government Administration	195
The Legal Status of Executive Policies	196
The Legal Relevance of Policies	196
The Weight or Influence of Policies: The Non-Fettering and Non-Abdication Rules	197
The legal consequence of ignoring, breaching or misconstruing a policy	203
Ministerial Directions and Other High-Level Policies	203
15. Discretion and Reasoning Errors 3: Unreasonableness	206
The Development of <i>Wednesbury</i> Unreasonableness	206
Contemporary Approaches to Applying <i>WU</i>	207
Irrationality, Illogicality and Unreasonableness	207
Distinction Between Application to Jurisdictional Fact-Finding and Exercises of Discretion	207
Illustrative Cases and Categories of unreasonableness	214
Lack of Plausible Justification	214
Capricious Use of Power	216
Evidentiary Weighting	217
Duty of Inquiry	218
Unjustified Unequal Treatment	219
Proportionality (related to unreasonableness)	220
Application of proportionality test in Australia	222
16. Remedies (Judicial Review)	223
Putting things rights (remedies of judicial review)	223
Remedies available in Judicial Review	223
Prerogative Remedies (judicial review remedies)	223
Remedy of Certiorari (judicial review remedies)	223
Remedy of Prohibition (judicial review remedies)	224
Remedy of Mandamus (judicial review remedies)	224
Equitable Remedies (judicial review remedies)	225
Equitable Remedies: Injunction	225
Equitable Remedies: Declaration	226
Remedies in Statutory Judicial Review	226
Features of s 16	227
Choosing the Appropriate Combination of Remedies	227
Discretion not to grant remedy	228
No Damages (Judicial review remedies)	229
Privative and Public Law Intertwined: Collateral Proceedings	229
Which court can grant the remedies?	229
17. Jurisdictional Error and Statutory Restrictions (Privative Clauses)	231
Introduction to Jurisdictional Error	231
Consequences of Unlawful Action	233
Consequences of Breaching a Statutory Provision	234
Jurisdictional error and invalidity	235
Australian Position towards Jurisdictional Error	237
Section 75(v) Rationale	237
The Separation of Powers Rationale	237
The Kirk Rationale	238
The Legislative Power Rationale	238

18. Judicial Review: Statutory restrictions on judicial review	240
Privative Clauses (Statutory restrictions on judicial review)	240
Privative Clauses in the Commonwealth Jurisdiction	240
Privative Clauses in the States	241
After Plaintiff S157 and Kirk: Privative Clauses Today	242
Constitutional considerations (Statutory restrictions on judicial review)	242
No-Invalidity Clauses	247
Conferral of Non-Compellable Powers	250
Restrictive Time Limits on Commencing Judicial Review Proceedings	252
Restricting Access to Information and Admissibility of Evidence Relevant to Judicial Review	252

1. Administrative Law – Theory, History and Context

Introduction to Administrative Law

- A feature of Australian history is that community relied on government to provide public services and communal life from the outset
 - Convict settlers relied on government to provide for everything
- Today, transport, education, income support, allocation of land have been under government control for much of Australia's history
- Australians have dealings with government officials and agencies throughout their lives
 - The power wielded by officials is considerable and has grown over time
- This in turn has led to public scrutiny and accountability

Dichotomies in Administrative Law Theory

Judicial regulation vs legislative / executive autonomy

- Parliament, government agencies and courts and tribunals play a part in government administration
- The boundaries of each actor is always subject to debate, reflecting different views
- These views reflect preferences: judicial scrutiny and control or executive antagonism
- A perfect example the Chief Justiceship of Sir Anthony Mason (1987-95), where he conducted a 'judicial activism' which sought to develop policies that addressed the societal problems
- Another example of pragmatism vs activism is the decision of the HC in *Minister of State for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs v Teoh HCA 20, (1995) 183 CLR 273*, where the court understood that international treaties created an expectation, even if it had not been implemented in domestic legislation
 - The government criticised it for exceeding the role of the court and legislated to overturn the ruling

Intervention vs restraint: red light / green light

- Also known as 'theoretical taxonomy' of red light / green light
- Red light theorists sought to stop collectivist State from redistributing wealth and interfering with personal liberty and private property, and focused on controlling (restraining State power)
- Green lighters sought to use the law to facilitate the State to regulate, redistribute and provide services
- 'Amber light' conceded the desirability and need for the exercise of public power and reject the view that public law should be seen exclusively in terms of control of such power, although forms of political control need to be buttressed by legal control.

Individualism vs collectivism

- The preferences of the administrative lawyers reflect preference for a individualist or collectivist view of the state
- Collectivist:
 - Decisions made with consideration of the broader social concerns
 - E.g. rational allocation of limited resources
 - E.g. predictability and consistency
 - Distributive and horizontal equity
 - Courts should understand the different functions of the executive

- Individualism:
 - Administrative review is concerned only with ensuring individual justice is achieved
- Conflict can be seen in these positions:

Sir Gerard Brennan 'Foreword' in R Creyke (ed), <i>Administrative Tribunals: Taking Stock</i> , CIPL, 1992
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public confidence in tribunals are better secured by their embracing the judicial model • Tribunal must be and be seen independent from the executive branch of government • Tribunal of independence and competence provides great benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Releases political system from reviewing administration ○ Gives assurance of integrity and administrative justice • A strong independent judiciary and, nowadays, members of administrative tribunals, is what secures freedom

S Skehill, 'The Impact of the AAT on Commonwealth Administration: A View from the Administration' in J McMillan (ed), <i>The AAT – Twenty Years Forward</i> , AIAL, 1998
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No constitutional principle of separation of powers that applies to administrative tribunals • Accordingly, they are part of the executive and they need to work with the rest of the elements of the branch • There is much to gain from operating in conjunction, maintaining the tribunal independence, but to enhance policies and decisions of the agencies

Sir Anthony Mason, 'That Twentieth Century Growth Industry, Judicial or Tribunal Review' (1989) 58 <i>Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration</i> 26
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judicial review is concerned with the operation and preservation of policy, paying subsidiary attention to the ascertainment of facts and the impact of policy on the interest of individuals • Administrative review places the emphasis on the ascertainment of facts and how the individual is affected by rule and policy • The judge's primary consideration is justice to the individual, in the belief that policy has been framed to operate sensibly • Administrators tend to be more concerned with the possible consequences of the decision than the justice or rightness in light of the facts

Justice Murray Wilcox, 'Judicial Review and Public Policy' (1989) 58 Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration 70
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although it is often spoken about accountability of the persons making the policies, the practical sense of it is limited, whether it that of ministers (only held accountable in very extreme cases) or bureaucrats (no accountable at all) • The criticism of the approach by the courts to review the substance (and not just the procedure) of the policies is the best remedy against tyranny. Court are not subordinate to the Administrators.

L Curtis, 'Crossing the Frontier Between Law and Administration' (1989) 58 <i>Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration</i> 55
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relevance of a decision is that it is made in accordance with the law, following the right process and not influenced by the personal or political preference and it is fair. • Policies should be carried out as long as they are not against the law for which policy directions and guidelines play an important part. • Legislation is not the only tool to articulate government policy and sometimes it will be necessary to involve administrators executing them.