1. Record Nr. UNINA9910968024703321

Autore	Cane Peter <1950->
Titolo	Administrative tribunals and adjudication / Peter Cane
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Oxford ; Portland, Ore., : Hart Publishing, 2009
ISBN	9786612444418 9781472560537 1472560531 9781282444416 1282444417 9781847315175 1847315178
Edizione	[1st ed.]
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (312 p.)
Disciplina	342.0664
Soggetti	Administrative courts Judicial review of administrative acts
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index
Nota di contenuto	1 Survey -- 1.1 The Project -- 1.2 Administrative Tribunals and Administrative Adjudication -- 1.2.1 The AAT is not a court -- 1.2.2 The AAT reviews decisions -- 1.2.3 The AAT's jurisdiction -- 1.3 The Plan of the Book -- 1.4 Conclusion -- 2 History -- 2.1 Introduction -- 2.2 1066 to 1800 -- 2.3 19th and 20th Centuries -- 2.3.1 The UK -- 2.3.2 The US -- 2.3.3 Australia -- 2.4 Conclusion -- 3 Models -- 3.1 The UK Model -- 3.2 The US Model -- 3.3 The Australian Model -- 3.4 The French Model -- 3.5 Conclusion -- 4 Form -- 4.1 Membership, Appointments and Composition -- 4.1.1 Membership -- 4.1.1.1 Expertise and Specialisation -- 4.1.1.2 The US -- 4.1.1.3 The UK -- 4.1.1.4 Australia -- 4.1.1.5 The Tasks of Non-court Administrative Adjudicators -- 4.1.2 Appointment Processes -- 4.1.3 Composition -- 4.2 Separation and Independence -- 4.2.1 The UK -- 4.2.2 Australia -- 4.2.3 The US -- 4.3 Structure and Systematisation -- 4.3.1 Jurisdictional Specialisation -- 4.3.1.1 Patterns of Specialisation -- 4.3.1.2 The Theory of Specialisation and Amalgamation -- 4.3.2 Supervision and Accountability -- 4.3.2.1 Hierarchical Supervision --

4.3.2.2 External Supervision -- 4.4 Conclusion -- 5 Function -- 5.1 Introduction -- 5.2 Categorising Governance Functions: the Legacy of Montesquieu -- 5.3 Merits Review -- 5.3.1 Merits Review is a Mode of Review -- 5.3.2 The Substantive Element of Merits Review -- 5.3.2.1 The 'Correct or Preferable' Formula -- 5.3.2.2 The Basis of Merits Review -- 5.3.3 The Procedural Element of Merits Review -- 5.3.4 The Remedial Element of Merits Review -- 5.4 Merits Review and Judicial Review -- 5.5 The 'Normative Function' of Merits Review and the AAT -- 5.6 Merits Review Outside the AAT -- 5.7 The Nature of Tribunal Review in Comparator Jurisdictions -- 5.7.1 The UK -- 5.7.2 The US -- 5.8 Conclusion -- 6 Purpose -- 6.1 What is Administrative Justice? -- 6.2 A Formula for Administrative Justice in Tribunals? -- 6.3 Jurisdiction -- 6.4 Standing -- 6.5 Processes -- 6.5.1 The Paradigm Mode of Decision-Making -- 6.5.1.1 The Reviewer -- 6.5.1.2 The Respondent -- 6.5.2 Alternatives to the Paradigm Mode -- 6.6 Resources -- 6.7 Conclusion -- 7 Landscape -- 7.1 The Accountability 'Sector' -- 7.2 Tribunals and Ombudsmen -- 7.3 Tribunals and Internal Review -- 7.4 Tribunals and Courts -- 7.4.1 Australia -- 7.4.2 The US -- 7.4.3 The UK -- 7.4.4 Re-conceiving the Relationship Between Courts and -- Tribunals -- 7.5 Tribunals and ADR -- PDR -- 7.6 Conclusion

Sommario/riassunto

Among the many constitutional developments of the past century or so, one of the most significant has been the creation and proliferation of institutions that perform functions similar to those performed by courts but which are considered to be, and in some ways are, different and distinct from courts as traditionally conceived. In much of the common law world, such institutions are called 'administrative tribunals'. Their main function is to adjudicate disputes between citizens and the state by reviewing decisions of government agencies - a function also performed by courts in 'judicial review' proceedings and appeals. Although tribunals in aggregate adjudicate many more such disputes than courts, tribunals and their role as dispensers of 'administrative justice' receive relatively little scholarly attention. This wide-ranging book-length treatment of the subject compares tribunals in three major jurisdictions: Australia the UK and the US. It analyses and offers an account of the concept of 'administrative adjudication', and traces its historical development from the earliest periods of the common law to the twenty-first century. There are chapters dealing with the design of tribunals and tribunal systems and with what tribunals do, what they are for and how they interact with their users. The book ends with a discussion of the place of tribunals in the 'administrative justice system' and speculation about possible future developments. Administrative Tribunals and Adjudication fills a significant gap in the literature and will be of great value to public lawyers and others interested in government accountability