

Wildlife and Countryside Link Parliamentary Briefing: Criminal Justice and Courts Bill - Part 4 - Judicial Review

June 2014

Wildlife and Countryside Link (Link) brings together 44 voluntary organisations concerned with the conservation and protection of wildlife and the countryside. Our members practise and advocate environmentally sensitive land management, and encourage respect for and enjoyment of natural landscapes and features, the historic and marine environment and biodiversity. Taken together our members have the support of over 8 million people in the UK and manage over 750,000 hectares of land.

This response is supported by the following members of Link:

- Buglife – The Invertebrate Trust
- Campaign to Protect Rural England
- Client Earth
- John Muir Trust
- Open Spaces Society
- Ramblers
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
- Salmon and Trout Association
- The Wildlife Trusts
- Woodland Trust
- WWF-UK

Concerns

Link is concerned that Part 4 of the Criminal Justice and Courts Bill will deter civil society from bringing and intervening in environmental cases (regardless of the merits) by making the threat of legal costs uncertain and intimidating. This could push the UK into further non-compliance with key provisions of EU and international law¹, as recently confirmed by the European Court of Justice², and result in a further loss of public trust with decision-makers.

Please note:

The clause numbers quoted here relate to those in the published version of the Bill of 2.4.14 (Bill 192 2013-14, as amended in Public Bill Committee

http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/2013-2014/0192/cbill_2013-20140192_en_1.htm) we understand that the numbers have since changed.

Action

Link therefore seeks the removal of clauses 52-58 from the Bill altogether. In the alternative, we suggest the addition of a revised clause 58 (on page 58, at line 15) as follows:

“58 Application of clauses.52-57 to environmental claims

Clauses 52-57 of the Act shall not apply to judicial review proceedings which have as their subject an issue relating wholly or partly to the environment within the meaning of the Aarhus Convention.”

Detailed briefing

¹ Aarhus Committee findings in the following cases: ACCC/C/2008/27 and ACCC/C/2008/33
² *R (Edwards + Pallikaropoulos) v Environment Agency + others* [2013] ECR I- 0000. (Case C-260/11)

Background

Part 4 of the Bill includes proposals that would constrain the effectiveness of Judicial Review (JR). These changes apply across the board, despite the fact that procedures in relation to environmental cases are protected by EU and international law. These provisions will compound recent amendments to JR, have little or no apparent evidential basis and are widely opposed by environmental and public interest groups.

Procedural defects (clause 52)

Clause 52 seeks to amend the Senior Courts Act 1981 so that a case could not proceed unless it was considered that it was “highly likely” that the outcome would have been different if the correct procedure had been followed.

Link does not support this provision of the Bill for a number of reasons. Firstly, the net effect of a requirement for a substantive assessment of the case would be delay and extra cost for, at best, very little benefit. Secondly, the judiciary is already able to consider cases against a “no difference” threshold. That is, the courts can currently refuse a judicial review hearing if the outcome to a certain decision is ‘inevitable’. Secondly, a substantial number of cases involving procedural flaws usually mean a failure to properly consult or hear the views of individuals. The imposition of a “no difference” threshold would be a very subjective assessment from the Court at the permission stage (so without hearing any evidence) and making them step into the shoes of the decision-maker as articulated by the judge in *Holder v Gedling Borough Council & Ors* [2014]³. In any event, the outcome sought in some cases is a declaratory judgment, which may have limited impact on in that particular case, but which recognises the importance of determining points of principle.

Finally, JR is about fairness. If an unfair procedure is followed it is inevitably hard to find instances where it is clear that the outcome would have been the same under a fair process. So, for that reason the courts are rightly reluctant to hold that it would have made no difference. But the fact that the court already has a flexible power to reach this conclusion in appropriate cases means that this clause is in practice unnecessary.

Information about financial resources (Clauses 53 and 54)

Clause 53 requires JR applicants to provide the court with any information about the financing of the application. Clause 54 requires the court to consider whether to order costs to be paid by potential funders identified in that information. These proposals extend beyond any current requirement in civil cases and represent a damaging and unprecedented practice.

Link is concerned that the requirement to disclose financial information about non-parties will deter people from being willing to fund JR – and thus prevent applicants from being able to bring cases. JR is already a daunting prospect for local people and campaign groups and is only used as a last resort. Further, we believe the proposal conflicts with EU law⁴, in that individuals and/or NGOs (who may not even be party to the proceedings) will be exposed to uncertainty as to whether they face any financial liability as a result of the claimant losing the case (and, if so, to what extent).

We recognise the need for appropriate transparency and for the court to have access to proportionate information. We are concerned, however, that these provisions could result in campaign and community groups being unable to fundraise and secure local support in order to progress cases for fear that individuals (who might be members of an NGO) will become liable for further costs being imposed on them by the court.

Interveners and capping of costs (Clause 55)

³ EWCA Civ 599, paras 24-25

⁴ See *Commission v UK* (Case C-530/11)

Clause 55 enables the High Court and Court of Appeal (subject to exceptional circumstances) to order an intervener to pay any costs that the court considers have been incurred by a party to the proceedings as a result of the intervener's involvement. Interventions have played an important role in establishing the law - in *Garner*⁵, an intervening Coalition of NGOs contributed views on the appropriate levels for Protective Costs Orders (PCOs) in environmental claims.

The usual procedure is that individuals and groups who apply to intervene in a case do so on the basis that they will only be responsible for their own legal costs and will not seek to recover costs from either party. Link believes the assumption that those seeking to intervene in a case may have to pay additional costs conflicts with the aims of the Aarhus Convention. The rationale behind the access to justice pillar of the Convention is to provide procedures and remedies to members of the public so they can have the rights enshrined in the Convention enforced by law. Access to justice helps to create a level playing field for the public seeking to enforce these rights. Individuals and groups can fulfil this vital function not only by bringing cases, but also by highlighting or emphasising important environmental legal and/or factual issues by way of intervention. Measures that will frustrate the ability of civil society to ensure the rights enshrined in the Convention are enforced are obstructive and retrograde. Moreover, this proposal gravely limits judicial discretion (despite a lack of evidence that judges are misusing their discretion) and arguably represents interference in the separation of powers.

Further, there is no evidence to suggest that interveners impose additional costs on the parties⁶ and we question why the Government wishes to proceed with it in light of the Government's recognition that interveners can "add value, supporting the court to establish context and facts".

What is needed?

Clause 58 of the Bill seeks to give some protection to environmental claims by enabling the Lord Chancellor to make regulations providing that clauses 56 and 57 do not apply to JRs which in his/her opinion relate entirely or partly to the environment. However, as environmental claims currently enjoy absolute protection under Part 45.43 of the Civil Procedure Rules, this section introduces an unwelcome degree of uncertainty. Additionally, it unnecessarily requires additional regulations to be published. As set out above, we therefore recommend that clauses 52 to 58 of the Bill be deleted. Failing that, we recommend the amendment above be tabled in place of existing clause 58. Note that the revised clause 58 (above) has no bearing on the introduction of a permission stage for statutory appeals (including environmental cases).

For further information, please contact:

Matt Shardlow: matt.shardlow@buglife.org.uk; 01733 201210; 07921 700151 or
Carol Day cday2948@gmail.com; 07972 159847; 0208 858 2948

Matt Shardlow and Carol Day are Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, of Link's Legal Strategy Group.



Wildlife and Countryside Link
89 Albert Embankment, London, SE1 7TP
W: www.wcl.org.uk

Wildlife and Countryside Link is a registered
charity (No. 1107460) and a company limited
by guarantee in England and Wales (No.3889519)

⁵ *Garner v Elmbridge Borough Council* [2011] EWHC 86 (Admin)

⁶ See Ministry of Justice Impact Assessment (Key Assumptions and Data for option 1c – cost provisions against interveners) available at: <https://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/judicial-review/results/jr-impact-assessment-2.pdf>